

It is mandatory that we pass it because education is so important to the future of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am always happy to support education programs because they are a wise investment in the country's future. I have seen the beneficial results of Federal assistance to our school systems up and down my district. We have a long way to go, to be sure. But we have made progress since my school days and part of this process is because of Federal aid and Federal programs.

Nothing is more distressing than the waste of human potential through lack of a good education. And nothing is more important in preventing such waste than the effort to dispel ignorance with good schools, good teachers and first rate instruction materials. Without a good education, most young people are deprived of a chance to reach their full potential. And if allowed to become widespread, this personal defeat can produce defeat for the country. In this competitive world, America cannot succeed if a large part of her people are uneducated or poorly educated.

So this education bill is one of the most important bills we will vote on this year because it will affect the future of our people and of our country in ways that few other bills will.

The Education and Labor Committee has earned our support for this bill. I urge adoption of the rule so we may proceed to its consideration and passage.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Weiss). Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

□ 1645

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to improve elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes, with Mr. VOLKMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, education is the single most important issue facing the Nation today. It is the foundation upon which our economic security, international competitiveness, and national defense are based. It is the key to a balanced budget and a growth economy.

As the National Commission on Excellence in Education, so poignantly stated:

Our Nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world.

While we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people . . . others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments.

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament.

We have before us, today, in the provisions of H.R. 5, a rearmament declaration: the tools necessary to attack illiteracy; to stem the tide of educational drop-outs; to reverse declining test scores; to close the gap in math, science and advanced skills; and to achieve equity and excellence.

H.R. 5 is the most comprehensive education reauthorization bill to be considered by this body in almost a decade. The School Improvement Act of 1987 has broad bipartisan support, and I would like to take this moment to express my commendation of Mr. JEFFORDS—and my deep appreciation to my colleague, Mr. GOODLING, for his tireless efforts in working to fashion this consensus bill, as well as the other dedicated members of the Education and Labor Committee who worked so hard to bring this omnibus legislation before us today.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 5

Briefly, I would like to summarize the major provisions of H.R. 5.

First, it is the consolidation of 14 expiring programs and reauthorizes them through 1993.

Second, adds new authorizations over current policy of \$779 million without exceeding function 500 budget limits.

Third, extends the current chapter 1 program with a preschool component—\$50 million—which also includes parental involvement; a secondary program to target dropout prevention and national demonstrations to upgrade basic skills development—\$100 million.

Fourth, the bill orders a concentration of funds to reach the neediest without shortchanging any districts currently receiving aid.

Fifth, we strengthen accountability.

Nonimproving schools are held accountable to the State educational agencies.

Improving schools are rewarded—schoolwide plans; 5 percent local matching for innovative programs.

Sixth, H.R. 5 restores parental involvement in design and planning.

A. Without mandating councils, we call for participation in parent-school relations through training, and training in assisting parents in their children's learning.

Seventh, this bill helps private schools that were adversely affected by the 1985 Supreme Court Felton decision, to better cope with the additional costs of services for chapter 1 private school children.

Eighth, we reauthorize the Adult Education Act, and increase funding, provide outreach, State matching, and community input to encourage volunteer action.

Ninth, in bilingual education, we strongly support a continuation of using the student's native language as an effective way to reach english proficiency, while at the same time, have fashioned a delicate compromise which will continue these programs and allow the increased use of alternative methods of instruction provided additional funds are voted.

Tenth, Chapter II contains greater encouragement of innovation and effectiveness.

Eleventh, refocus of math and science programs; provide \$25 million for gifted and talented; and retention of Impact Aid and Drug Free Schools Program.

Twelfth, cost in every decision we, as policymakers, debate, we must weigh the benefits and the costs of our actions. In the case of investing in the education of our children.

Achieving a more skilled and productive work force;

Increasing our international competitiveness; and

Increasing individuals' earnings, so that more money flows into the Treasury instead of out in the effort to deal with the negative effects brought on by lack of education.

There are all benefits which far outweigh the costs envisioned in H.R. 5.

This omnibus legislation epitomizes what a strong democracy is all about. I urge you to join with me and our colleagues from both sides of the aisle in voting yes on H.R. 5. The most significant investment the 100th Congress will make in our greatest assets, the education of our children, and the development of our human capital.

□ 1650

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished

ranking member, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS].

(Mr. JEFFORDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987.

The Committee on Education and Labor is once again being looked to as a source of important legislation to address the major problems facing our Nation. Current legislation dealing with trade, health, and welfare all contain significant education provisions. Congress is looking to educators and students across the country to create the conditions for change that must occur in order for America to maintain its social, economic, and competitive position in the world.

H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987, is the backbone of the Federal effort to assist elementary and secondary schools in this effort. This legislation would reauthorize chapter 1, chapter 2, the Education for Economic Security Act—the math and science program—the Bilingual Education Act, the Adult Education Act, and many other smaller programs which focus on specified educational areas. In addition, it would create a limited number of new authorizations to address pressing national problems, such as school dropouts.

During the past 7 years the Federal involvement in education has evolved. Programs that were no longer needed have been eliminated, small categorical programs have been consolidated with great success, and the programs that have proven track records, strengthened and improved.

Chapter 1, educational assistance for disadvantaged students, is an excellent example of this latter category. After 20 years, it is now widely acknowledged as a program that is fine tuned and effective. Every year thousands of Vermont youngsters receive extra educational assistance through chapter 1. At a committee hearing held in Waterbury, Vermont, we heard from teachers, parents, and students that this is a successful program and that its continuation is critical.

Members of the Education and Labor Committee have taken great care to make adjustments in chapter 1 while avoiding the temptation to tinker with those parts that work. At the full committee mark up, I offered an amendment which would create a minimum grant level of one quarter of 1 percent in the chapter 1 basic grants section. This will allow small States to continue to serve its students regardless of changing economic and demographic conditions in the State and the Nation. For example, with sufficient new funding, Vermont's chapter 1 grant would increase over 20 percent when compared to what it would receive under H.R. 5 without such a provision. I would add that the minimum funding provision was carefully constructed to ensure that no State would

lose existing chapter 1 funds as a result of its implementation. I am convinced that chapter 1, as reported from committee, will effectively continue to serve our children into the next decade.

H.R. 5 also includes amendments to the chapter 1 Handicapped Program. The effect of these amendments would be to clarify the purposes of the program, bring the chapter 1 program into alignment with part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, and foster new and innovative approaches to increasing opportunities for handicapped children to participate with their nonhandicapped peers. These amendments would not alter the funding formula in current law, nor change the fundamental structure or purpose of the chapter 1 Handicapped Program. Under these amendments States can continue to support preschool programs for the handicapped, educational programs for the severely handicapped in a variety of settings, and support handicapped children from State programs who are transferred to local education agencies.

There are many other provisions in H.R. 5 that are worthy of attention and praise, but given the length of the bill and the shortness of time, I will only address one other specific part of the legislation. Title VII of H.R. 5 contains the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act. This program is both very controversial and very important to the education of millions of limited English speaking students. I was involved in the negotiations that led up to the compromise we are considering today and can report on the good faith of all the members involved. There were some of us who originally felt that this legislation should go further in terms of allowing increased flexibility for school districts. However, this compromise moves the bilingual education program in this direction, while establishing a broad base of support for its continuation.

In closing, I would like to congratulate all my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor for their hard work in constructing this bill. I would like to especially recognize Mr. HAWKINS and Mr. GOODLING, chairman and ranking member of the Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education Subcommittee, for their fine craftsmanship that is evident throughout the bill. H.R. 5 is a disciplined piece of legislation, avoiding the temptation to create numerous new programs. Its most important function is to extend a number of tried and true educational programs, while extending the federal role into a select number of new areas. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987.

I would like to observe that in 1965, at the very earliest stages of that Congress, it was my privilege as a new Member of this body to come to this floor with the same subcommittee and stand beside the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] as we passed Lyndon Johnson's initiative of that year for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is really the father of all these programs that are being reauthorized in this legislation.

Over the many ensuing years we have learned a lot, and we have had some tough budget times. We have had to accommodate to those, and they have done some damage to the legislation. But basically over the years it has brought us to where we are now, with a piece of legislation that takes a very realistic view of the budget and a very realistic view of the needs of education for the targeted population. I think it strikes a reasonable balance that will be supported overwhelmingly by this House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my special tribute and give thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], chairman of the full committee, and I want to acknowledge the cooperation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], from the minority side of the committee in bringing to the floor as well-balanced and a good piece of legislation that all of us can proudly support. I think it is in the fine tradition of the Committee on Education and Labor that has tried always to move ahead to the future.

Mr. Chairman, this is an omnibus bill, incorporating extensions of authorization for 14 Federal elementary and secondary education programs slated to expire in fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989. H.R. 5 continues the Federal commitment to education begun many years ago, and we continue it now for another 5 years into the future. Everything that I see and hear out across the country indicates that the American people would want this to be so.

I believe this is a good piece of legislation, I commend it to all the Members for their study, and I know they will be proud later to have participated in putting this legislation on the books.

Mr. Chairman, it was in 1965 that what is still known and referred to as title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA] was originally enacted as a cornerstone of President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty. In 1981, the legislation authorizing this program of compensatory education for educationally disad-

vantaged children, was substantially revised and is now chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act [ECIA]. Even so, the program's stated aim remains the same as it was in 1965, to serve disadvantaged children who attend schools serving relatively low-income areas.

Chapter 1 has always been a highly targeted program, and studies show that those children intended to be served are being served. Recent studies show that program objectives, such as enhancing educational opportunities for children in low-income families, and raising the academic achievement of those children, are being met. Chapter 1, as improved and expanded under H.R. 5, will continue to provide equal educational opportunities for disadvantaged children.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5 continues and enhances our longstanding commitment to educational opportunity in this country, not only for chapter 1, but for 13 other Federal education programs encompassed in the bill. H.R. 5 achieves this by offering programs that are intended to reaffirm, as a Federal policy, the assurances that each school-age child and, in many cases their parents, will have access to quality education, that children with special needs will have those needs met, and that excellence will continue in abundance, to be an integral part of our public education system.

Because the overwhelmingly successful chapter 1 program is primarily intended to reach a targeted group of children—those attending school in low-income areas, but who also have need of remedial education, the committee strongly believed that there was a need to make concentration grants available—so that school attendance areas—counties and school districts—could concentrate their chapter 1 grants in schools with high numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children—and thus reach many more eligible children than such schools have been able to serve in the past. This provides for better targeting, while protecting the basic chapter 1 grant by providing for \$400 million over and above the fiscal year 1987 funding level specifically for concentration grant purposes.

H.R. 5 extends and revises chapter 2, the education block grant to the States. It has been streamlined to the extent that, while it still serves all school-age children, it does so through programs selected at state and local discretion and implemented according to established need. Chapter 2 has been further revised to impose new requirements as well as provide incentives for State and local educational agencies, so that block grants will be used to support effective schools and to require State and local accountability for the expenditure of these scarce Federal grant funds.

In the case of both chapters 1 and 2, H.R. 5 expresses the sense of the Edu-

cation and Labor Committee that each program deserves and very much requires full funding so that no child will be deprived of a free and appropriate public education.

I would be remiss if I did not commend my colleague, Mr. GOODLING the ranking minority member of the committee, for his foresight in offering the Even Start Program as part of H.R. 5—a program designed to assist not only eligible chapter 1 children with remedial education needs, but also to provide literacy training programs for semiliterate parents of those children. This will involve those parents in the education of their own children, while being educated themselves. This important program will give answer to the urgent recommendation of the experts that a child that is read to at home, by his or her parents, is better able to achieve academically than the child whose parents cannot read to them, or otherwise be involved in their scholastic experiences. The parents of those children will now have that chance. I am very pleased that 3 percent of funds appropriated for Even Start will go to migrant children and their parents.

H.R. 5 extends and revises title II of the Education for Economic Security Act, better known as the Math-Science Act. It revises the program in a manner that will focus more of those scarce dollars at the local level, to enable teachers and students alike to prepare for and respond to an increasingly technologically oriented society.

The Adult Education Act, as extended and revised by the provisions in H.R. 5, makes a concerted effort to address the adult illiteracy problem that besets our Nation, by targeting funds so that "all adults are able to acquire basic literacy skills." It is estimated that between 17 and 21 million young and old adults in this country today are illiterate. It is my sincere hope that these new program initiatives will be funded so that we, the richest nation in the world, can begin to eradicate illiteracy.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5 continues the historic requirement that private school children residing in eligible school districts received chapter 1 services on an equitable basis with children in public elementary and secondary schools.

In 1985, the Supreme Court ruled in *Agular versus Felton* that publicly paid teachers could not provide compensatory education services on private school premises, particularly religious schools. As a result of that court ruling, there was an estimated 35-percent drop in the number of private school children receiving compensatory education services in the year following the decision.

H.R. 5 authorizes \$30 million in fiscal year 1988, and such sums thereafter as may be necessary for a program to help school districts purchase capital equipment—such as mobile units—to provide chapter 1 compensa-

tory education to eligible private schools in a manner compatible with the court's 1985 ruling.

Because the provision to appropriate Federal funds to assist school districts in meeting capital expenses required in order to continue to serve private and religious schoolchildren under chapter 1 is unprecedented, I amended H.R. 5 to require a GAO study of the impact of the *Felton* decision on private schools, and whether the provision of capital expenditures will enable school districts to again serve the numbers of children they were serving prior to the *Felton* decision, as is intended by the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, other programs being initiated and reauthorized under H.R. 5 include: Bilingual Education, Magnet Schools, Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, Indian Education, Impact Aid, Women's Educational Equity, Territorial Teachers Programs, the Ellender Fellowships, Dropout Prevention, Gifted and Talented, Immigrant Education and Secondary Schools Basic Skills Programs.

While I have been a strong supporter of education programs at all levels during my 22 years of service on the Education and Labor Committee, and while it has been a responsibility I have addressed with great personal pride and sense of duty over the years, I would like to specifically outline two major programs being reauthorized under H.R. 5: The Migrant Education Program and the Education Audit Reform Act, which have had my close personal attention:

AUDIT REFORM

The audit reform amendments have evolved over a period of almost 4 years. There has been extensive consultation between representatives of State and local educational agencies, civil rights and child advocacy groups and the Department of Education. The amendments strike a balance. On the one hand, they provide relief for State and local education agencies from the unfair and arbitrary features of the audit process. On the other hand, they preserve the process of accountability through auditing that ensures that funds are spent for their purposes as stated in law.

An oversight hearing on audit reform was held by the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education on April 10, 1984, and a staff reauthorization forum on this subject was held on December 17, 1987.

Legislation comparable to these amendments was adopted by the House as part of H.R. 11, the Education Amendments of 1984. Unfortunately, the audit reform provisions of H.R. 11 had to be deleted in conference with the Senate, and audit reform provisions in last year's Higher Education Act reauthorization were also dropped in conference. This year the prospect for Senate agreement to

audit reform appear to be much better.

Let me highlight five features of these audit reform amendments:

First, the amendment replace the Education Appeals Board with administrative law judges. Administrative law judges will have legal training, experience with educational programs and be full time. The members of the current Education Appeals Boards do not have to have legal training, they need not be experienced with educational programs, and they are part time.

Second, the amendments provide for an orderly and limited process of discovery available to the State and local education agencies. Currently, discovery is not available to these agencies, and they do not have the opportunity to review the Department's case against them in deciding whether and how to appeal.

Third, the Secretary of Education will be required to establish a *prima facie* case for the recovery of funds in the preliminary departmental audit decision. There is no current requirement that a *prima facie* case be established to support an audit finding. A *prima facie* case is one that would sustain the finding if there were no evidence to the contrary.

Fourth, the amendments provide that the amount of funds recovered in an audit will be proportional to the amount of harm that has been done to the achievement of the purposes of the Federal education programs. For example, if a State or local educational agency receives a \$5 million grant under a Federal education program and misuses \$100,000, then the maximum audit liability of the educational agency will be \$100,000, not \$5 million as in current practice.

Finally, the amendments provide for mitigating circumstances under which funds could not be recovered in an audit. If a State or local education agency relied on erroneous written guidance from the Department of Education, if they received no written guidance from the Department in response to a specific written request or if the alleged violation resulted from following a judicial order, the State or local educational agency will not have to repay funds.

The Migrant Education Program was first enacted in 1966 in recognition that the Federal Government has a compelling responsibility to address the severe educational problems which are unique to the children of migrant workers in this country. When viewed against any indicator of the probability of failure in school, migrant students stand out as the most likely group to fail. As a whole, they tend to be older than their peers in school; they exhibit a high degree of language difficulties; they come from families in which the combined annual incomes of both parents is \$10,000 or less and in which as a rule neither parent has graduated from high school; and they

have a pattern of high mobility with frequent interruptions in their schooling. The list goes on and on. These children have had every reason not to succeed in school. Indeed, in 1974 the dropout rate for migrant students was estimated to be as high as 90 percent.

Today, there is strong evidence that the dropout rate for migrant students has been dramatically lowered to somewhere between 40 and 50 percent. Furthermore, this extraordinary achievement is attributed largely to the efforts of federally funded migrant educators working directly with these children and to the consolidated approach to the problems taken by the State directors of migrant education and the Interstate Migrant Education Council. Together they've provided a comprehensive plan of services to migrant children traveling within and between the States throughout the school year. An integral component of this overall approach is that of the migrant student record transfer system [MSRTS] which transmits vital up-to-date information on the academic and health records of the individual child when he or she arrives at each school.

H.R. 5 continues the migrant program in its present form with several important improvements which will strengthen its overall thrust.

The program is reauthorized retaining the language of current law which calls for full funding of this State administered program. Within this context, the bill extends for funding purposes the age range of children served of 5 to 17 years to an expanded 3 to 21 years. This provision highlights the need to establish a national policy which recognizes and addresses the severe educational needs of children of migrant workers, beginning before they enter formal schooling and continuing well beyond the average age of graduation from high school.

The bill encourages parents to continue their strong participation in all aspects of their children's education by requiring that the Migrant Education Program be planned and operated in consultation with parent advisory councils in addition to conforming to the improved provisions for strong parent participation for the chapter 1 basic grant program.

The bill expands the requirement that the migrant programs be coordinated with other Federal programs from which migrant children can benefit. This provision will help to formalize the relationship between the Migrant Education Program and other programs leading to better services to migrant children and greater educational opportunities beyond high school.

The bill also authorizes the development of a national certificate of eligibility to assist with the administration of the program, and it provides for the development of a program of accrual and credit exchange to facilitate graduation from high school.

Finally, the bill establishes a National Commission on Migrant Education to examine the changing demographics of the migrant student population and to develop a blueprint of the program for the remainder of this century.

Mr. Chairman, in exercising its responsibility for oversight and reauthorization of the vital education programs contained in H.R. 5, the committee went about its work in the strong belief that now is the time for the Federal Government to fulfill its role in education reform. We did not do so in a vacuum. We undertook our task, fully armed with a plethora of information and statistics gleaned from reports such as "A Nation at Risk," "High School," "Action for Excellence," and "Making the Grade." We have also relied on studies and reports by the U.S. General Accounting Office [GAO], the National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP], the National Center for Statistics, the Office of Technology Assessment, and many others.

H.R. 5 embodies our principles of promoting access and excellence in new, innovative programs. For example, there is a separate national demonstration program to address the basic skills needs of secondary students, and for dropout prevention programs that will work. There is a new Gifted and Talented Education Program for those children who find themselves on the other end of the spectrum—that of being able to achieve beyond their age and grade level, but who need the teachers and special educational resources in order to grow to their full potential.

Throughout the bill that is before us today, the committee has made a great, and I believe successful, effort to improve the quality of all the education programs encompassed in the omnibus H.R. 5, and to hold schools more accountable for the outcomes of the programs authorized. We have successfully provided for more accountability with respect to how funds are spent, and with regard to improving the achievement levels of the children intended to benefit. And I believe we have done so without imposing excessive administrative burdens, or an undue hampering of local flexibility.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that through our collective efforts, we have revised and extended 14 important education programs in a manner that will not raise the cry of "budget busting." We have achieved our goal in a manner that allows us to regain much ground lost over the past 6 years, while allowing for modest growth among our programs contained in H.R. 5.

Again, I congratulate Chairman HAWKINS, and the ranking minority member, Mr. GOODLING of Pennsylvania, for their foresight, their commitment to excellence, their energy and, in fact, their overwhelming sense of

caring about the education of children in the United States that is so superbly evident in H.R. 5.

Mr. Chairman, I commend H.R. 5 to my colleagues in the Whole House as a comprehensive, yet thoughtfully crafted, package that will, when enacted, have an immensely beneficial effect on education throughout the remainder of this decade, and the beginning of the next.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. SAIKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

(Mrs. SAIKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

(Mrs. SAIKI addressed the Committee. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, for the last 3 or 4 weeks we have heard a lot of discussion on this floor in which we were solving all of the trade problems, all of the trade deficit problems, all of the defense problems, and all of the foreign policy problems, and I am here to say that we cannot solve any of those unless we solve another serious problem that we have in this country. That problem is that we have somewhere between 26 million and 60 million functional illiterates. Unless we attack that problem, all the rest of the things we do will go for naught.

So I rise in support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act.

First of all, I want to say that I think our committee chairman should get the honor of being the gentleman of this century that carries a big stick and talks softly, because certainly that is what happened when we put this bill together. The chairman of our committee insisted that it was going to be bipartisan. The chairman of our committee insisted that we were going to do all of our fighting in committee. I hope that we will show the Members when we come to the floor that that is just exactly what we have done. We believe we have put together through cooperation and through a bipartisan effort a bill that is going to serve the best interests of the young people of this country.

No matter what problem arose, we were always able to work it out. Whether it was the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT], or whether it was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] or myself, whoever it was, we found a way not to give everybody what they wanted but to give every body at least a piece of the action and an opportunity to improve our educational system.

It was mentioned, I think, earlier today on the floor of the House how we have to do all sorts of things to attract teachers. That is the one part of our bill where I am not sure what we can do at the Federal level. The problem with attracting the brightest and the best deals with the starting salaries, and I do not know that we are in a position to do much about that in this committee or perhaps on the Federal level.

We have authorized chapter 1, and we have reauthorized the largest and most ambitious of the programs. It has had a long history of success. However, there were some things that people said needed to be improved as we traveled throughout the country. I think we have improved those.

We have added a few different things to the program. I tried to put in the Even Start Program, and I got the support of the committee, which we hope will attack the functional illiteracy problem at home, dealing with the preschool youngsters and with their parents at the same time.

The chairman's effective school program should enhance a good learning environment for all. It should help end the dangerous dropout problems facing this Nation, which was a part of the proposal of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

So I think we have improved a good program in chapter 1, and I think we have made it an even better program. We have used targeting, which causes some problems, but at the same time we knew we had to target better than we had in the past.

We also took chapter 2, one that has enjoyed great success, and I think we have improved that program also. We say that the purposes include using the funds for at-risk and high-cost children, effective schools, instructional educational materials and equipment, personnel training and development, and special projects such as programs for gifted and talented students, youth suicide prevention, technological education, community education, and career education.

Again I cannot give enough congratulations to the chairman of the committee for being an outstanding chairman and bringing about a consensus and a bipartisan effort, one that I think most Members of the House of Representatives can go back to their districts with and say, "We did our share. Now it is up to the local district and the State to implement some of these things and improve education."

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act. This bill is a culmination of months of work. We have held hearings around the Nation and here in Washington to develop this comprehensive bill. H.R. 5 includes all expiring elementary and secondary programs in this the 100th Congress. It includes a reauthorization

of such vital programs as chapter 1, chapter 2, adult education, and math and science for teacher training as well as providing for new programs like Even Start which are good additions to the framework set by this bill.

Chapter 1, the largest and most ambitious of the programs, has enjoyed a long history of success. The program directs Federal dollars for basic skills to economically and educationally disadvantaged youngsters. Since its inception in the mid-sixties this program has changed the lives of millions of our Nations young people by improving education within our Nation's neediest schools. But as good as any program can be there is always room for improvement. I believe we have substantially improved a sound and successful program which addresses the changing demographics in our Nation without altering the program in any radical way.

Within the framework of chapter 1 we have added a preschool program, Even Start, which brings together illiterate parents and their preschool-aged children. Even Start is designed to educate these parents and get them involved in their preschool aged children's educational development. It attacks educational disadvantage by breaking the cycle of illiteracy within families. The chairmans effective schools program which will enhance a good learning environment for all and help end the dangerous dropout problems facing this Nation.

We also included a reauthorization of chapter 2, a program authorized in 1981. This program too enjoys widespread support. It allows for flexibility by allowing the State and local educational agencies to decide how best to structure a program to meet their particular needs within five broad Federal purposes. These purposes include using the funds for at-risk and high-cost children, effective schools, instructional and education materials and equipment, personnel training and development, and special projects such as programs for gifted and talented students, youth suicide prevention, technology education, community education, and career education. The bill retains the flexibility which has made chapter 2 so popular and so successful.

Furthermore, the bill includes such vital programs as the Adult Education Act which will attack a growing problem in our Nation, the illiteracy among our Nation's adult population. It includes a reauthorization of a major teacher training program in mathematics and science. Without getting better qualified teachers and updating teacher's skills, how can we hope to improve the quality of education in our Nation schools.

Furthermore, the bill includes necessary changes to the auditing process in the Department of Education by amending the General Education Provisions Act. These amendments make both substantive and procedural

changes to the auditing process in the Department. For many years States have had to fight enormous Federal audits without the tools to defend themselves. These amendments strike the necessary balance between giving the States the ability to defend themselves, yet, retain the Department's ability to seek out and recover misexpended funds. The amendments insure States will receive a fair opportunity to present their cases before professional judges with expertise in education law. We have guaranteed the States discovery rights, which they lacked in the past, to acquire information which will allow them to prove what the facts truly are. The amendments include a provision for mediation of matters, so that disputes can be fairly and efficiently resolved before an adversary relationship ensues. They also require that the Department publish its decisions so that these decisions are easily accessible to State and local educational agencies.

Finally, this bill fits well within the budget. The bill calls for \$779 million in new authorizations. The budget allows for \$2.2 billion over current services for fiscal year 1988 for new education authority. The Appropriations Committee will have plenty of budget authority to include funding for these programs and authorizations.

Again, I rise in support of this bill. I have enjoyed working on this legislation with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I encourage Members to join me in voting for its passage.

□ 1705

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and in support of some amendments that I will be offering tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to comment on reauthorization of the School Improvement Act. This legislation includes many important programs at the elementary and secondary levels aiding our Nation's youth to become well-educated and productive citizens. Among these programs are several to aid the educationally deprived and to improve basic skills in several areas, bilingual education programs to help those born into non-English speaking families successfully integrate into our society, and Impact Aid funds to assist the many school districts in our country that serve large numbers of federally connected children, many of them from families in the armed services.

There is, however, one area of focus which until now has been largely neglected at the Federal level: foreign language and international education in our Nation's elementary and secondary schools. Because there is a recognition that these areas should be a major focus before as well as after students leave high school, I am proposing amend-

ments to H.R. 5 which would authorize the creation of two new foreign language programs in the School Improvement Act and restore funds for a third program.

Clearly, this country is sorely lagging behind in training its young people, and future workers and leaders, to be able to communicate with the rest of an ever-shrinking world. Our future national security and economic prosperity depend to an increasing extent on improvements in foreign language and international education.

In today's highly competitive international economy, inferior language capabilities are handicapping our domestic industries from the outset. Former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Trade Frank A. Weil has noted that our language deficiency is "one of the most subtle nontariff barriers to our export expansion." As technology shrinks the distance separating the nations of the world, we find ourselves dealing with foreign nationals with greater and greater frequency. Across the negotiating table, in our laboratories, through business deals, and in academic conferences we place ourselves at an immediate disadvantage by our limited ability to communicate. We must wake up and recognize that English is no longer the only game in town. One of the key themes, and tasks, for this Congress is restoring America's "competitiveness" in a highly complex, rapidly changing world. Improving our foreign language training capability is a concrete and attainable goal in the context of international trade and our place in the world economy. It is a substantial way to give content to the "buzzword" of competitiveness.

We must improve the quality and scope of our foreign language and international training at all educational levels. There is much evidence that children learn foreign language best at an early age, and in many countries around the world, foreign languages are studied from the primary grades onward. Yet in the United States, only 1 percent of elementary school students are exposed to a foreign language in school, and fewer than that number studies languages spoken by three-fourths of the world's population: a 1982-83 survey showed that only 21.3 percent of all high school students were enrolled in foreign language courses, 88 percent of which were in Spanish and French.

While it is true that important provisions in the area of foreign languages have been included in both House and Senate trade legislation, and this is laudable, it is unfortunately by no means certain that this legislation will become enacted in its present form in this session of Congress or that the foreign language provisions will be retained. In addition, the importance of foreign language training, on which all seem to agree, seems sufficient in and of itself to warrant inclusion of this area in the most important education legislation in Congress.

My first two amendments would add new foreign language programs to the School Improvement Act: grants to the States to establish model foreign language programs, and Presidential awards for excellence in teaching foreign languages. The third amendment would restore the earmarking of funding for a "critical languages" program under the Secretary of Education's discretionary fund. The total cost of this package is less than the ele-

mentary and secondary foreign language component of the trade legislation.

The reauthorization of the School Improvement Act is an important step in ensuring a sound future for our Nation's educational system and, most importantly, the children who learn in our schools. The additional investment in our future national security and economic prosperity that would be required by adding these foreign language programs to H.R. 5 is relatively small, yet the stakes are high. I urge you to ensure a solid, proper place for foreign language training at the elementary and secondary levels by supporting these amendments when considering the School Improvement Act.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987. I am pleased to have worked with my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee to author bipartisan legislation designed to serve the children of our Nation. I would also like to commend Chairman HAWKINS for skillfully guiding this important measure through the committee.

H.R. 5 is a comprehensive piece of legislation which reauthorizes 14 Federal elementary and secondary education programs. Although this bill addresses a number of programs critical to the education of our children, I would particularly like to highlight title VII, the Bilingual Education Act.

Mr. BARTLETT and myself, along with Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. GOODLING, have crafted a compromise bill on bilingual education that enables us to bring this bill to the floor with strong bipartisan support. The purpose of bilingual education, as stated in this year's legislation, reads:

Such programs shall be designed to enable students to achieve full competence in English, and to meet school grade-promotion and graduation requirements.

Two goals are stated here: To enable children to become proficient in English and at the same time, to prevent them from falling behind in other subjects.

It would be a terrible failure for a student to go through this Nation's school systems without learning English. Not only would the educational system of this country have failed, but society as well would bear the blame. Title VII ensures continued growth and support for proven methods of bilingual instruction, but allows for growth in alternative programs also.

Title VII also contains a new provision, which I authored, that allows programs under part A, financial assistance for bilingual education programs, to use funds under this section to provide technology-based instruction to students in these programs. A recent report by the Office of Technology Assessment reveals that technology is still a small part of bilingual education. The report indicates, however, that where computers are being

used, limited-English-proficient [LEP] students are assisted in the acquisition of English.

Title VII also requires the Clearinghouse authorized in part B, data collection, evaluation and research, to coordinate its activities with the National Diffusion Network. This year's legislation simply ensures that the two systems work together with the goal of more effective dissemination of exemplary bilingual education programs.

H.R. 5 also incorporates H.R. 1896, the Magnet Schools Assistance Act, a bill I introduced, to support specific activities in magnet schools operating in desegregating school districts. Magnet schools specialize in different subjects and draw students from throughout an area with an interest or aptitude in that subject. As a result of this creative approach to education, magnet school classes bring together children from varying social, economic, and racial backgrounds. I am pleased to be the author of legislation which has historically enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

Finally, as the author of legislation, which became law, to establish a specific authorization for the National Diffusion Network [NDN] within the Secretary of Education's discretionary fund, I would like to emphasize new language that I have inserted in H.R. 5 to strengthen the program. The language simply ensures that funds for the NDN can be used only for activities directly related to that program.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5 is carefully designed legislation which ensures that the Federal commitment to education continues and develops. I urge my colleagues' support for this vital measure.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. ROWLAND].

(Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, which revises and extends through fiscal year 1993 14 major elementary and secondary education programs slated to expire in the next 3 years.

This legislation marks an occasion in the legislative process where we have the opportunity to pass the most far-reaching education bill of the decade. H.R. 5 reaffirms the Federal Government's promise to join States and local school districts in enhancing the quality of our Nation's elementary and secondary schools. This legislation offers a package of programs that collectively confirm our commitments to the access of quality education for students

with special needs, and excellence in education for the Nation as a whole.

The cornerstone of this reauthorization bill is the continuation of the chapter 1 program, a program to educate low-achieving students in poor areas. In this bill, the central purpose of chapter 1 is strengthened through provisions to target more funds on the neediest areas and to expand the program to the preschool and secondary level.

H.R. 5 also contains several elements aimed at upgrading the quality of instruction of our Nation's schools. The chapter 2 block grant is refocused to make it clear that these funds are to be on the cutting edge of educational improvement. Chapter 2 grants are used to help implement innovative programs or make special purchases when school districts do not have the local funds to do so.

Another noteworthy program in H.R. 5 is the mathematics and science education program. This program will be very beneficial in helping to strengthen economic competitiveness and national security by improving the skills of teachers and the quality of instruction in math and science.

Finally, I would like to express my support for the inclusion of the Gifted and Talented Children and Youth Education Act in H.R. 5. This new program which is designed to identify and meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented students would see that the special abilities of these children are developed and their potential for contributing is not lost.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5. The future of our Nation depends on ensuring that our children receive a quality education. This is an excellent piece of legislation which will have a meaningful impact on education through the end of this decade and the beginning of the next.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, let me join with those Members who preceded me in saying a special thank you and our congratulations to the chairman of the full committee, and our distinguished vice chairman of this particular subcommittee, Mr. GOODLING, and others who have worked so hard on this legislation.

For 12 years of my life and 12 years of his life my father served on our local school board; and during that time he said, we talk about college, and we talk about high school reform, but I think we forget that the real basic education in this country is in the elementary grades.

For the most part today the legislation before the House, while focusing on both elementary and secondary, is clearly a commitment to elementary education, and making sure we at the Federal level provide the quality of assistance that we can.

I would like to suggest briefly in my time period that there are three different elements that are very significant to us.

One of those deals with what we call carryover funds in chapter 1. Schools with small enrollments absolutely need flexibility in their allowance to carry funds over from one year to another.

As a result of hearings held in my district and other districts, our com-

mittee accepted an amendment which restored the 15-percent carryover funds in chapter 1. Likewise, an equally important concern to rural districts is the whole area of concentration grants.

There has been a great deal of discussion as to what proper formula ought to be enacted for concentration grants.

The gentleman from Kentucky, my good friend, and others had joined with me in that vow to make sure that we use true concentration grants as the test, not just numbers, and as the true cost.

We have made great progress in this particular effort in the full committee, and I am pleased to indicate that both the chairman of our committee and vice chairman have indicated that if the General Accounting Office is able to come up with further recommendations and options, that we can still look at that process down the road in conference committee.

The third and final concern that I have from a rural area focuses on chapter 2. Chapter 2 is our basic block grant of education. There is perhaps no more program that is necessary for local schools to utilize in buying basic equipment, teacher training or their other basic needs to meet their local needs.

There is some concern by various parties that this program ought to be focused into categorical grants. We have maintained our commitment to those local educators, that they truly indeed know what is best.

From these and other perspectives, we have maintained a proper Federal commitment to the quality of elementary and secondary education in H.R. 5.

I commend it to you for its approval.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

(Mr. HAYES of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to rise in strong support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement act of 1987.

This is indeed a momentous occasion. The House of Representatives has the historic opportunity to reauthorize 14 Federal elementary and secondary education programs. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I know first hand that each section of this measure has been carefully crafted to reaffirm the Federal Government's commitment to providing access to a quality education for each and every one of America's schoolchildren and at the same time, ensuring that that education is the best it can be.

In addition to the many noteworthy programs reauthorized by H.R. 5, the measure also contains many new and innovative programs which hold the prospect of significantly improving the

lives of countless American children and their families. I would like to make particular note of the Secondary School Programs for Basic Skills Improvement and Dropout Prevention and Reentry.

I take particular pride in this section since the dropout portion is based on my legislation H.R. 738, the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act. The committee has heard repeated testimony as to the tragedy that befalls hundreds of thousands of our young people who needlessly jeopardize their futures by dropping out of school. The number of children who drop out of school is truly a national tragedy that requires a national solution. Translated into actual numbers, one out of every four American schoolchildren, or upwards of 1 million per year, drop out before completing their education.

The dropout prevention and reentry section of H.R. 5 will provide the national focus that is necessary to bring about effective and innovative approaches to address our Nation's dropout problem. Recognizing the fact that children are dropping out of school not only in our large urban centers but also in our rural communities, the selective dropout prevention and reentry demonstration projects authorized in H.R. 5, will provide us with specific, and more importantly, proven dropout prevention and reentry strategies that work. In turn, this will allow us to use our limited financial resources in a more efficient and effective manner.

Mr. Chairman, while there are many many noteworthy aspects to H.R. 5, I want to also mention what I perceive to be one area that did not get the attention which I believe it so rightfully deserves. This is the impact aid section.

Since it was first passed by the Congress in the 1950's, there have been a patchwork of amendments added to it over the years. As a result, there is an unquestionable need for simplification and fine tuning of the program. That is exactly what would have occurred with a package of amendments I was prepared to offer if I had been able to obtain the necessary commitments to move forward in that regard.

As you know Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the Federal Government's obligation to reimburse public school districts for their inability to generate revenue due to the nontaxable presence of Federal property, impact aid was created. Over the years it has been expanded to include coverage for nontaxable low-rent housing units. I would like to say a few words on behalf of one category of youngsters in that area, the "low-rent housing children."

These are the youngsters who are concentrated in school districts which predominantly serve the poorer selections of our cities. These are very high-cost youngsters, in many cases coming from single-parent families which are already on public assistance

and are in desperate need of an education to break the poverty and welfare cycle. These youngsters come to the public schools with remedial needs in the areas of math and science, as well as in discipline, attendance, and even health education.

These children live in federally owned apartment buildings which, due to the high demand for rental units of inner city houses, would be an extremely valuable resource to the school district if it were able to produce real estate taxes. Due to its tax exempt nature and due to Federal ownership, this high priced low-rent housing youngster is placed into the school district from a family who is unable to generate sufficient tax revenue to even provide for its own needs and who lives in an apartment in a building which also generates no revenue.

Right now hundreds of thousands of low-rent housing children are being subsidized by as little as \$25 apiece through this program toward an education which costs thousands of dollars. My amendments would have corrected that inequity.

I submit to you that education is one of the ways to help these youngsters out of their poverty situation and into a more comfortable, productive lifestyle. While many of the programs reauthorized in H.R. 5 will address the educational needs of those youngsters, the school systems charged with the responsibility of educating these children are being short-changed due to the present funding formulas contained in our current impact aid law.

The undeniable fact is that these youngsters are not found in large numbers in the rural areas of our Nation. Unfortunately, they are found in our large urban centers, areas which are already financially burdened. Whether we want to face that fact or not, it is a reality that cannot be voided much longer. Sooner or later, this Congress must come to grips with balancing the needs of our urban centers with those of our rural areas. Increasing the reimbursement for low rent housing children in impact aid is but one avenue to start that process. Hopefully, it will come about in the not too distant future.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT], who has helped very much in pulling this together.

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5 contains a number of provisions that will improve the basic educational services provided to needy students around the country. I would like to focus on two of those programs: the State-operated Program for Handicapped Children and the Bilingual Education Program.

The State-operated Program for Handicapped Children, commonly re-

ferred to as the 89-313 Program, is the predecessor to the centerpiece of Federal special education policy, Public Law 94-142, the Education of the All Handicapped Children Act. The State operated program under chapter 1 was enacted by Congress in 1965 when most students with severe handicaps were being served in segregated facilities with little or no opportunity to interact with their nonhandicapped peers. The world of special education has changed considerably since 1965.

Ten years after Public Law 89-313 was passed by Congress, Public Law 94-142 was enacted and because of 94-142, segregation of severely handicapped student is today the exception rather than rule. However, our efforts to desegregate facilities serving handicapped students are not completed.

Provisions in H.R. 5 will take us another small step toward the goal of allowing handicapped students the opportunity to be educated alongside their nonhandicapped peers. I am convinced that more still needs to be done.

Today, more than 10 years after the passage of Public Law 94-142, there are thousands of mentally retarded and multiply handicapped school-age students who are inappropriately shut off from their nonhandicapped peers in segregated facilities. At the same time, in another State, or perhaps across a county line, handicapped children just as severely handicapped, are going to schools with their nonhandicapped peers, attending school activities, assemblies, and sports matches; eating lunch, playing games at recess, and probably most importantly of all, making friends with their nonhandicapped classmates. The fact that the majority of severely handicapped students are being successfully integrated and benefitting educationally, reinforces the inappropriateness of routine and wholesale segregation of these students.

Placing certain severely handicapped students in a self-contained program in a regular educational environment for instructional purposes is recognized as appropriate when such placement decisions are tailored to the individual needs of that student. When parents and handicapped students are not given an option to place their child in an integrated setting which provides an appropriate educational program, then one of the major principles of Public Law 94-142, and the intent of Congress are being ignored.

Integrating handicapped and nonhandicapped students has given special education students a host of opportunities that simply do not exist when they are placed in separate buildings. It has also done something quite incalculable for nonhandicapped students. Students in our public school system who interact daily with handicapped students are being given a lesson that past generations were deprived of. They are learning in a pro-

found sense about the range of human conditions that makes up our society. For many of our students, that educational experience may very well be the most important lesson they learn in school.

The majority of school systems around the country integrate their severely handicapped students with non-handicapped students. However, too many handicapped students are still being segregated for no valid educational reason. If these same students were being segregated without educational cause on the basis of race, or religion, or national origin, the Committee on Education and Labor and the Congress of the United States would be outraged.

H.R. 5 requires that States in their application demonstrated the plans, policies, and guidelines they have in place for transferring segregated students into appropriate integrated regular educational environments. I had urged the Committee on Education and Labor to move further toward integrating handicapped students but accepted this compromise in H.R. 5.

H.R. 5 also contains amendments to the Bilingual Education Program which testify to the bipartisan support this very important program is capable of generating. H.R. 5 modernizes and strengthens those provisions in the act which comprise the two-fold goals of the act: enable students to progress educationally and remain at grade level while becoming proficient in English.

The bill's provisions protect all of the current programs under part A of the act while providing for greater flexibility by the Secretary in funding alternative methods of instruction. These changes have broad bi-partisan support.

The need to improve and expand bilingual education programs is particularly critical at this time in light of the growing number of non-English-speaking students entering our educational system. I am confident that the improvements in the Bilingual Education Act will protect and maintain the positive elements of the current program, while providing local school systems with the flexibility they need to properly serve their limited English proficient students.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FLORIO].

(Mr. FLORIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge the support of my colleagues for H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987. In particular, I wish to express support of a provision of H.R. 5 which seeks to expand our Nation's efforts dealing with the basic skills of secondary school students.

Since the 98th Congress, I have jointly authored with Congressman WILLIAMS of Montana the Secondary Schools Basic Skills Act in order to ensure that our educational system will provide necessary support to bolster our students' basic skills. I am pleased that H.R. 5 includes a provision which uses the Florio-Williams bill as a springboard and provides funding for basic skills programs at the secondary school level.

Too many of our youth in this Nation lack the basic skills necessary to function and contribute productively to our society. In the short space of one generation, we have not only lost our position of economic leadership in areas where we prided ourselves on our technical prowess.

At the same time, we have witnessed deeply troubling developments in the educational attainments of our people. Twenty-seven million American adults are functionally illiterate. A 1982 international test of math skills showed that the better U.S. secondary school students had average scores well below those of students from other countries.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Competitiveness, I am concerned about the deterioration of the ability of our people to compete in the world market. Without some prompt response, our situation will become even worse.

It is estimated that 13 percent of all 17-year-olds have inadequate basic skills. Functional illiteracy among urban youth may run as high as 40 percent. A fair proportion of our youth have trouble reading a newspaper or instructions on medicine labels or filling out a job application. Some of these people are in the position of defending our Nation. A Navy report recently indicated that one-quarter of its recruits cannot read at the 9th grade level, the minimum requirement for reading simple safety instructions.

In my own State of New Jersey in 1983, of the 50,000 entering freshmen taking the New Jersey college basic skills test, less than one-third were proficient in verbal skills and basic math. Only 12 percent were proficient in elementary algebra.

Because of inadequate preparation, colleges are now having to teach basic skills. Throughout the country, efforts are underway to develop remedial instruction programs to high school students who are achieving at a low level. But such efforts are sorely underfunded at the secondary level. Less than 5 percent of chapter I compensatory funds are currently being spent at the high school level.

Some schools are doing a great job of making sure that all students are mastering their basic skills. However, the great majority of the schools do not have adequate funding or access to the expertise other schools develop to carry out these programs. The basic

skills provisions of H.R. 5 reverse this trend.

The bill authorizes \$100 million for the next three years for demonstration projects for basic skills programs at the secondary school level and for dropout prevention programs. During phase 1 of the program, half of the \$100 million would go to both efforts. The bill also authorizes funding for phase 2 of the program which would allot States money on a formula basis in order to be able to implement the techniques developed during the first phase of the program.

I am confident that these provisions of H.R. 5 will offer secondary schools and their students a fighting chance. Although the funding in this bill is much less than the original Florio-Williams proposals, these provisions would set the stage for an important undertaking. It is only through efforts such as this that we will be able to build out Nation's resources and once again take a leading place in the world market.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5 and oppose any efforts to delete these necessary provisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, and I commend the Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] and Mr. GOOBLING for their excellent leadership in developing this comprehensive legislative package for extending and amending Federal programs in elementary and secondary education. These efforts are the foundation of the Federal effort to provide quality educational opportunity to all America's school children and thus form the foundation upon which our Nation's very future rests.

I thank the chairman for including my adult education amendments in H.R. 5. These amendments are important because they clarify that the purpose of the act is to improve educational opportunities for adults who lack the level of literacy skills requisite to effective citizenship and productive employment. As an additional focus, my amendments will help States establish adult education programs that will enhance the level of literacy in the Nation, and will provide the targeted adult population with sufficient basic education to enable them to benefit from job training and retraining programs and to obtain and retain productive employment.

I especially want to commend the gentleman from California on your efforts to continue and expand programs to meet the special needs of disadvantaged children through the chapter 1 program. As the largest program of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools, chapter 1 has received bipartisan support from Congress and praise and support from virtually all segments of the education enterprise—parents, teachers, administrators—as well as persons from the business community because the pro-

gram has effectively contributed to students' achievement. We know this program works.

I am pleased that this legislation incorporates much of the Secondary School Basic Skills Act, H.R. 1227, which I authored, along with my colleague, Jim Florio, to provide assistance to our secondary schools to meet the special needs of low-achieving economically disadvantaged high school students.

We need this bill now more than ever. Our Nation's preeminence in international trade is facing unprecedented challenges from foreign competition. Our friends around the globe are seriously challenging us both in the marketplace of goods and in the marketplace of ideas.

There is no single cause nor is there a single solution to our current predicament. However, improvement in the basic skills of our secondary school students must be an integral part of the solution.

There is compelling evidence from numerous sources of a disturbing decline in recent years of high school students' math and reading skills. This decline is particularly pronounced among those who are economically disadvantaged. Clearly, something must be done, and, I believe, there should be a Federal role in finding the solution.

In 1965 Americans identified a crisis in our schools, and Congress enacted title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to address it. Educators responded to the call to improve the basic skills of our elementary school children who are educationally and economically disadvantaged. Our elementary school teachers succeeded in dramatically improving the skills of these children.

Just as we are succeeding in the elementary grades, I believe we also can succeed in the secondary grades if we direct sufficient resources to provide the compensatory programs so badly needed. The Congressional Research Service reports that according to data from the Department of Education, only 1 percent of chapter 1 participants are in grade 12; 2 percent in grade 11, and 3 percent in grade 10. CRS also reports that, although there has been extensive effective schools research concerning elementary schools, very little has been done in the secondary schools.

The legislation before us today provides additional resources to enable our secondary schools to sustain the successes made in the elementary grades. Though we have a long way to go, I believe this legislation represents a significant step forward, and I am pleased that it incorporates significant provisions of H.R. 1227.

Again, let me commend the excellent leadership provided in bringing together this omnibus legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill. H.R. 5 represents an investment in our Nation's most precious resource—our children. There is simply

no more important investment we will make.

□ 1720

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

(Mr. FAWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. HAWKINS, and the vice chairman of the Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee, Mr. GOODLING, are to be commended for their fine effort in putting together H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act.

The School Improvement Act reaffirms a strong Federal commitment for elementary and secondary education. The bill makes several improvements in major elementary and secondary education programs, particularly in chapter 1 compensatory education, math and science education, and bilingual education. Although I have some very serious concerns about the increased authorization levels proposed for these education programs in 1988, I believe the improvements cannot be overlooked. I think it is important to highlight the bills major improvements in these programs.

Chapter 1 is the centerpiece of Federal elementary and secondary education for improving the basic skill needs of educationally disadvantaged children. H.R. 5 makes needed improvements in this program to help these children attain grade-level proficiency.

One major improvement is a new provision which allows local school districts to establish innovative projects for enhancing chapter 1 services. A school district will not be able to use up to 5 percent of its chapter 1 allocation for various innovative activities. These activities include offering incentive payments to schools with successful chapter 1 programs, training regular classroom teachers to work with chapter 1 children, and fostering active community and private-sector involvement in chapter 1.

Schools will now be accountable for their chapter 1 programs and be required to demonstrate student achievement. Schools that have declining chapter 1 achievement must turn to the local education agency [LEA] for technical assistance. If there is not improvement in chapter 1 achievement rates, the State educational agency [SEA] must intervene and provide the technical assistance to reverse the declining achievement trend. This provision ensures that schools will be accountable for addressing the educational needs of chapter 1 students.

Parental involvement is also critical to successful academic achievement. H.R. 5 recognizes the strategic role parents have in the education of their children. School districts must implement programs to involve parents in chapter 1. Allowable parental involvement activities include training par-

ents to work with their children at home, encouraging school personnel to work and consult with parents, and establishing parent advisory councils.

Parental involvement in chapter 1 is also achieved through a new Even Start Program. The purpose of this program is improve the education of at-risk children by integrating early childhood education and adult education for parents into a unified, family-centered program. The Even Start Program recognizes that childhood advancements in education are linked to the presence of literate parents at home.

Targeting of chapter 1 funds was also an issue of serious debate in committee. The committee rightfully recognizes that a correlation exists between low academic achievement and areas with high levels of poverty. The first \$400 million of new chapter 1 appropriations will be targeted to school districts with high concentrations of poverty.

The committee is commended for essentially retaining the chapter 2 block grant in its present form. By continuing the current State formula allocation, whereby 80 percent of the funds is distributed to the LEA's and 20 percent to the SEA, State and local authorities will maintain the flexibility and discretion to implement programs that respond to new challenges in education.

The committee wisely did not consider turning back the clock to restore categorical set asides for the use of chapter 2 funds. Instead, the committee maintains the program's flexibility by allowing the use of funds for at-risk and high-cost children, effective schools projects, instructional and educational materials, personnel enhancement, and special projects, including gifted and talented education.

The School Improvement Act provides a teacher training program in math and science education—Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act—which should produce successful results. The current program, established in 1984, has been ineffective because of hampering set-aside and reporting requirements. The bill streamlines many of these reporting requirements and attempts to channel most of the appropriations to the local level. H.R. 5 now gives us a program which should produce good things in math and science education.

One of the problems, however, of driving funds to the local level is that too many school districts receive small grants. This is particularly true of this program, which has never received an appropriations in excess of \$100 million. The committee responded to this concern by accepting an amendment which requires school districts that receive grants of less than \$3,000 to form a consortium with other school districts or higher education institutions. An exemption from this requirement

is provided for schools in rural and sparsely populated areas.

Although the consortium requirement is an improvement, a better approach I pursued in committee is to award teacher training funds to school districts on a competitive grants basis if the title II appropriations is less than \$150 million. The rationale for a competitive grants program is sound. A \$150 million appropriations allocated to LEA's on a formula basis results in grants of less than \$1,000 to 33 percent of the country's school districts and grants of less than \$5,000 to 71 percent of the country's school districts. A competitive grants competition ensures that all of the title II funds are used efficiently and for effective teacher training purposes.

The committee also accepted an amendment to increase the allocation for the Secretary's discretionary fund for national programs from 3 to 5 percent. Because title II is a relatively new program, direction at the Federal level to determine what works in math and science teacher training critical. With funds for national programs, the Secretary will be required to inform State and local school authorities of exemplary teacher training programs conducted at the national level.

The changes made in bilingual education are also a step in the right direction toward recognizing that native-language instruction is not the exclusive method of instruction for teaching limited-English proficient [LEP] children. H.R. 5 allows up to 75 percent of new appropriations in bilingual education to be used for special alternative instruction programs, usually English as a second language [ESL] and English immersion.

Although this change moves in the right direction, it does not go far enough. A better approach is found in legislation proposed by the Secretary of Education which would lift the 4-percent cap under part A programs for special alternative instruction. This cap effectively earmarks an overwhelming majority of part A funds for transitional bilingual education programs in native-language instruction, although the research does not demonstrate that transitional instruction is more effective than alternative instruction in teaching LEP children.

It has been demonstrated, however, that many school districts want to provide special alternative instruction to LEP children because they believe this approach best suits their bilingual needs. In 1985, the first year special alternative instruction funds were available, one-fourth of the applications for Federal funding were for special alternative instruction programs; 25 percent of the applications were for 4 percent of part A funds.

In hearings before the Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee this year, the director of Prince Georges County Public Schools ESOL program, Lillian Falk, testified in support of giving local school districts the

flexibility to determine which method of instruction best suits the need of LEP children. Ms. Falk convincingly showed that Prince Georges County, which must educate LEP children from 126 different language backgrounds, cannot use transitional bilingual instruction in its programs. According to Ms. Falk, the county's ESOL approach "provides the very diverse students we are serving with the most efficient, most rapid way of preparing them to understand, speak, read, and write English."

Congress should recognize what is desired at the local school level and eliminate the set-asides in part A. Local school districts are in the best position to determine the needs of its LEP children. Although the changes in H.R. 5 are positive, I would have preferred that our committee had eliminated any prescription on the type of instruction for this program.

The School Improvement Act is the first major elementary and secondary education bill to come along since 1981. The next one will not come until this reauthorization expires in 1993. The improvements made in current programs by H.R. 5 deserve the support of my colleagues.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA].

(Mr. AKAKA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the School Improvement Act, H.R. 5, to improve and enhance the quality of education in America's elementary and secondary schools.

Let me first of all commend Chairman HAWKINS for his perseverance and commitment to the development of an initiative that not only ensures access to quality education for disadvantaged students and other students with special needs, but also maintains excellence in education for the Nation as a whole.

Likewise, I would like to take this opportunity to praise and thank Representatives WILLIAM FORD, JAMES JEFFORDS, DALE KILDEE, WILLIAM GOODLING, PAT WILLIAMS, BILL RICHARDSON, and their staffs, for their unrelenting commitment to this measure, and their forthright response to my calls for assistance.

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege for me today to rise in support of H.R. 5, because I think it is an important bill. In particular, title VIII, part E of the bill addresses a problem that has long gnawed at our country: The severe educational status of our native Hawaiians.

Part E of title VIII is the culmination of more than 10 years of effort to provide services to native Hawaiians so that they may experience the scholastic achievements they so rightly deserve. That persons of native Hawaiian ancestry have suffered disproportionately from educational inequality for some time has been clearly documented. Six years ago, Congress authorized the creation of a Commission to Study and Identify the Educational Needs of

Native Hawaiians. The native Hawaiian educational assessment project which resulted was generously completed by the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate at no public expense, and by 1984 had been submitted to both the Department of Education and the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

The study revealed some very devastating findings:

Overall, native Hawaiians score below parity with national norms on standardized achievement tests. Furthermore, while native Hawaiian students in general continue to score below parity with national groups, the disparity with local groups is even greater;

Native Hawaiians are disproportionately represented in many negative social and physical statistics, indicative of special educational needs. Lower educational achievement among native Hawaiians has been found to relate to lower social-economic outcomes. Indeed, educational needs of native Hawaiians are inextricably interwoven with other social and physical needs. Many of these have either direct educational spinoff effects or are themselves conditions which could be alleviated through educational means; and,

Native Hawaiian students have educational needs which are related to their unique cultural situation.

In addition, recent studies indicate that native Hawaiian students continue to score well below national norms in achievement tests of basic skills. An estimated 37 percent of Hawaiian elementary students register in the lowest scoring groups, compared with a meager 12 percent in the uppermost groups—versus 23 percent nationally in each class.

The list of dire statistics goes on and on, Mr. Chairman.

H.R. 5 exhibits a sensitivity to the needs of native Hawaiian students heretofore unseen on the floor of this body. The bill, rightfully, recognizes the power and the obligation of the Federal Government to legislate for native Hawaiians who are in critical need of educational success.

Indeed, the question of providing services to a distinct group of native Hawaiians arises when comparisons are made between native Hawaiians and American Indians. While the political/historical relationship between native Hawaiians and the United States is not identical to that between the United States and Indian tribes, in some ways they are parallel. The similarities are many: both groups lost most of their homelands and their sovereignty over such lands to conquerors of European extraction. In turn, both Indians and Hawaiians became minorities in their own countries and their numbers were decimated by white man's diseases. Significantly, both groups are at the bottom of virtually all the charts of socioeconomic indicators—health, education, income, job status, and so forth.

While the similarities are many, including the fact that the United States made and broke treaties with governments of Indian tribes as well as the Hawaiian kingdom, the differences are important too: those American Indian tribes which survived as units have kept intact tribal governments which are still recognized as sovereign by both the Federal and State Governments. Hawaiians were self-governing until 1893, when the government of Queen Liliuokalani was overthrown in an insurrection engineered by a group of western

businessmen who sought the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. The U.S. Minister to Hawaii ordered the landing of U.S. marines and sailors and recognized the new provisional government even before the Queen's defenses had surrendered. It was 4 years before the U.S. Government accepted annexation and in 1898, Hawaii became a U.S. territory.

The economic conditions of the native Hawaiians deteriorated and, in 1920, the U.S. Congress legislated directly for their benefit by enactment of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. The act established a 200,000-acre land base for native Hawaiians for homes, ranches, and farms. The lands are currently administered by a Commission composed entirely of persons of Hawaiian ancestry. When the act was before the Congress, one of the issues considered was whether Congress has the power to legislate for the benefit of native Hawaiians. At that time, the solicitor of the Department of the Interior provided an opinion upholding Congress' power to enact legislation for native Hawaiians under its power to legislate for the benefit of Indians in general. A similar conclusion was reached by the attorney general of the territory of Hawaii.

When Hawaii became a State in 1959, the responsibility to administer the Hawaiian Home Lands Commission was transferred to the State of Hawaii but Congress retained the sole authority to amend the essential terms of the act, as well as for enforcing the act. This, in fact, has indeed been tested, and upheld, by the passage of a measure which I authored, House Joint Resolution 17 (Public Law 99-557) during the 99th Congress. Public Law 99-557 renders the consent of Congress to amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920. There is, therefore, a continuing trust obligation on the part of the United States that is vested in Congress to make sure the Hawaiian lands are properly managed for native Hawaiian people.

The power of Congress to legislate for Hawaiians has been exercised through several different laws passed by Congress: native Hawaiians are eligible for programs operated by the administration for native Americans, for job training programs at the Labor Department, and for vocational education, adult education, and library services programs through the Department of Education.

Just as the U.S. Government was created without the consent of the Indian tribes, so was Hawaii made a U.S. territory without consent of its native population. Just as treaties and executive orders reserved to Indian tribes certain aboriginal lands for their exclusive use and benefit, so the Hawaiians Home Commission Act ceded original Hawaiian lands back to native Hawaiian people for their exclusive use and benefit.

In consideration and recognition of the trust relationship between the Federal Government and native Hawaiians, H.R. 5 authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Education to make direct grants for the implementation of native Hawaiian model curriculum projects in public schools. In addition, it directs the Secretary to assure implementation in a minimum of 20 public schools by the 1992-93 school year.

The measure further directs the Secretary to make direct grants to native Hawaiian organizations to develop and operate 11 family-based education centers through the State. Centers shall include parent-infant programs,

preschool programs, and a long-term followup and assessment program.

The Secretary, under the bill, is also directed to make grants to the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate for demonstration programs to provide higher education fellowship assistance, and postbachelor degree fellowship assistance to native Hawaiian students.

Finally, the bill authorizes projects that address the special education and gifted and talented needs of native Hawaiians.

With respect to the gifted and talented provisions, I would like to simply mention that, while the bill does not address the possibility of a centrally-located Gifted and Talented Program, I recognize the value of launching such an endeavor. Indeed, the Senate has already approved a similar native Hawaiian educational measure to that contained within H.R. 5, S. 360.

S. 360 directs that the gifted and talented demonstration project authorized under the bill be located at the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii. Native Hawaiians make up the largest ethnic group of high school students on the big island and, with the current 51 percent Hawaiian birth rate, this population group will dominate the island's schools in a few years.

A gifted and Talented Program is in place at Waiakaa High School in Hilo with an experienced staff. This will constitute a valuable resource for the demonstration project at the university. Additionally, Hilo High School is now a magnet school for the performing arts, attracting students gifted in those fields.

Clearly, these factors favor location of the gifted and talented project at the University of Hawaii at Hilo, and I will support any initiative that achieves such action. Likewise, I would urge the committee's favorable consideration of such an initiative.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend the thanks and support of our native Hawaiians to the committee for its gracious consideration of these provisions. This legislation provides a promising option in addressing the needs of native Hawaiians. It is comprehensive, innovative, prudent, and most importantly, responsive.

I urge my colleagues support for the measure.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5, and I would like to congratulate the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee and all the members of the subcommittee for their long and tedious work which produced a bill which returns to the original spirit of this Great Society piece of legislation.

The spirit of the original enactment will be found in this bill. It is a monumental piece of landmark legislation. It covers many different areas, and I would like to comment on just two of those areas.

I think that it is very important that this bill did return in some measure to the requirement in chapter 2 that libraries and librarians be involved in the planning processes, and that more

of a priority be assigned to books and library resources. We pay a great deal of lip service to the idea of libraries and books and information being at the center of the activities of our society, but when it comes to resources, the allocation of resources, we fall down. There is a blind spot that runs through the entire society, and that blind spot is most devastating in our elementary and secondary schools.

The other aspect that I think is very important is the recognition in a small way, a greater recognition, of the original intent of the Great Society legislation which emphasized participation by parents and participation by the communities in the development of programs related to chapter 1. We do have some language, not as strong as I would like it to be, which recognizes in greater measure the role of parents in the process. Again, we pay great lip service, a great deal of lip service, to the concept of parents as partners in the educational process, but professional educators repeatedly refuse to allocate resources to allow parents to really participate by offering them the kind of training that they need and the kind of opportunities for participation that they need. In some small measure we have begun to get back to some of the spirit of the original legislation which called for greater parent participation.

I wish that it would be possible for me to say to the parents who are involved in this program across the country that we now have a requirement in that a certain percentage of the budget must be set aside for parent-participation activities, but that is not there. There is enough language there, I hope, for parents to begin to make demands on their local administrators for greater participation and more resources to participate.

In all, it is a remarkable piece of legislation, and I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987, and I commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], for their work on this fine legislation and for their leadership in making education once again a high priority of this Congress.

H.R. 5 revises and extends through fiscal year 1993, 14 major elementary and secondary education programs. The measure focuses largely on two programs—chapter 1 and chapter 2—but also confronts such important issues as adult education, bilingual education, impact aid, and drug education. H.R. 5 retains the current chapter 1 formula-grant distribution

method and authorizes \$2.6 billion for the remaining 13 programs. This bill is obviously the most far-reaching education bill of the decade.

The Federal commitment to access for special needs students is underscored through the continuation of the chapter 1 program as the cornerstone of this reauthorization. In the bill, the central purpose of chapter 1—educating low-achieving students in poor areas—remains the same and is ultimately strengthened through provisions to target more funds on the neediest areas and to expand the program to the preschool and secondary levels. Chapter 1 grants to school districts support supplementary educational services designed to increase the academic performance of children whose skills fall below expectation. Studies consistently have shown modest improvements in the reading and math skills of chapter 1 participants for every grade level. In addition to being a successful, effective program, chapter 1 is also cost effective. The cost per pupil is less than one-fourth the cost of grade repetition for the same child.

H.R. 5 also expands access to special needs groups in other ways. The bill focuses additional dollars on the most disadvantaged, illiterate adults and students with limited English proficiency. The bill also reauthorizes other equity-related programs; the Women's Educational Equity Act and the magnet schools assistance program, to encourage voluntary school desegregation.

As the ranking minority member of our House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I am particularly interested in title 5 of this measure, the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986, which would authorize \$200 million for fiscal year 1987, \$250 million for fiscal year 1988, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1989 through 1993 for Federal grants to assist State and local governments in developing their drug education and prevention programs.

Title 5, which is nearly identical to title 4 (B) of the Omnibus Drug Act that became Public Law 99-750 last year, primarily removes the \$250 million authorization cap for drug education programs enacted under Public Law 99-570.

Funds from this authorization would also be available to the Governors of each State in the form of discretionary grants directed toward high-risk youth as well as grants to local governments, nonprofit groups—including parent groups, community action agencies, and community-based organizations—for local, broadly based substance abuse prevention programs. Funds would also be available for grants to institutions of higher education, for drug abuse training, demonstration and prevention programs and activities.

Under H.R. 5, the Omnibus Drug Act of 1986 would be expanded by adding a youth suicide prevention program to other programs where the States pass funds to local governments and other nonprofit entities for drug abuse prevention programs.

Regrettably, the administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1988 would drastically reduce drug education programs from \$250 million that the Congress authorized in Public Law 99-570, to \$100 million, on the ground that, according to the administration, these programs represent one-time start up costs.

Mr. Chairman, preventing and controlling drug abuse will not be achieved today or tomorrow and it does not represent a onetime commitment. Rather it is a constant, never-ending battle in which we must help raise the consciousness of our citizens as to the dangers of drug abuse. The measure before us today represents congressional commitment to help achieve that objective: To assist our State and local communities in protecting our citizenry by developing drug prevention programs. At a time when marijuana, cocaine, and heroin and other dangerous drugs are sweeping across our shores by the plane load and by the boat load, we must provide our communities, and our front line drug agencies—those who actually reach our youth—with the resources to combat this deadly menace.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5 is a bill for the times. It confronts head-on most of the critical issues in education today. It enjoys bipartisan support and has received support from all segments of the education community, including: the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the National PTA, and the U.S. Catholic Conference. Accordingly, urge my colleagues to join in supporting this omnibus education bill.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time, as many others have before me, to congratulate the chairman, congratulate the staff, and congratulate the ranking minority member and the people who have been working together to try to make this piece of legislation law.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I rise to speak of my support for H.R. 5, the School Improvements Act of 1987. The many hours of negotiations and compromise have led us to the floor today with a piece of legislation that, I hope, will be supported by all Members of this distinguished body.

In particular I want to congratulate the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Chairman HAWKINS, for his fine job of leadership throughout this process. His willing-

ness to work with all members of the committee on important issues, such as the concentration grants, insured that this bill would address the educational needs of all sectors of our communities.

H.R. 5 is a compilation of many programs, ranging from the popular and well known chapter I programs to the less publicized programs for gifted and talented children and the adult literacy initiatives. Because of this broad spectrum of programs we will be touching the lives of many Americans in the coming years and this legislation provides the structure to do it in a very positive and meaningful way.

From my perspective the continuation of the chapter I program is the cornerstone of this bill. This program targets extra educational assistance to the low-achieving students in the poor areas of our country. A criticism of the program in the past was that some of the children receiving the benefits of chapter I were not poor enough. Well, we address these concerns in this legislation by requiring the use of the most recent census data in the determination of need and the targeting of funds to the poorest of the rural and urban children with the creation of the concentration grants. These grants would use the next \$400 million of new money that flows into the program to target the funds on those that are the neediest.

I feel that with the passage of H.R. 5 we will be renewing our commitment to the children of today. With this commitment these are the children that will be carrying on our dreams of exploring the universe, discovering cures for today's diseases, and leading this country back to the world leadership position in technology and education. Without this commitment then we will be admitting that we are willing to accept our Nation's rapidly approaching status as a second-tier country that follows rather than leads in today's world environment.

Overall the committee has been able to report an excellent bill and I would urge the Members of the House to send a strong signal to both the Senate and the President, saying that we want to see the educational commitment to our children passed and supported.

□ 1730

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to an outstanding new Member of our committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5. As a member of the authorizing committee, I can assure the Members of the House that this legislation is vitally important to every community in the country.

Education is primarily a function and responsibility of the States. This

bill gives the States a great deal of flexibility and discretion in carrying out the programs it authorizes. We are continuing the philosophy reflected in the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, which improved the ability of the individual States to implement the programs they believe would best serve their students. I applaud that effort. And the leadership of our chairman and vice chairman which has continued the committee's commitment to excellence in education.

Reauthorization of the chapter 2 program, at a level above the fiscal year 1987 level, provides for flexibility. The chapter 2 program has broad support across the country—parents, teachers, and school administrators have all indicated that chapter two funds have made a significant contribution to basic skills development, educational improvement, and support services. Many districts use these funds to purchase equipment and supplies or for improving library resources. Without these dollars, many districts would be unable to strengthen instructional programs and supplement the instructional skills of their teachers.

I would also like to call attention to Federal research on rural districts authorized by H.R. 5. Many Members know full well the difficulties being faced by some of our rural districts. Declining enrollments and consolidations are increasingly posing severe problems in districts across the country. This legislation directs the Secretary to study ways of improving the delivery of services to these districts so that the dollars we allocate are spent most efficiently.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and commit this body to improving the future of our children.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

(Mr. McCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987. I want to commend Chairman HAWKINS and Representatives JEFFORDS and GOODLING, the ranking minority members of the Education and Labor Committee for their efforts in creating a bipartisan, comprehensive reauthorization of our elementary and secondary education programs.

This measure represents the Federal Government's commitment to our greatest resource, our children, and to public education as we head toward the 21st century.

Education is a national priority and should be treated as such in the Federal budget. H.R. 5 is a sound and cost-effective means to invest in our Nation's future, to increase productivity, and to extend the benefits of a democratic society to all our citizens.

During debate on the trade bill, we talked about competitiveness and our need to level the playing field in the international trade field.

We cannot compete effectively if we ignore a growing population of undereducated and unprepared citizens.

H.R. 5 strengthens public education which is the foundation that must be built upon to ensure that we maintain our competitive edge. Among other items, this bill reinforces mathematics and science education by authorizing \$400 million for fiscal year 1988 and such sums as may be necessary for the next 5 fiscal years for the critical skills improvement program. I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the world will little note nor long remember anything I say on this occasion, but in the 2 minutes allotted to me for this great debate on H.R. 5 I did want to rise not only in strong support of the legislation, but to pay tribute to you, our very distinguished chairman, to my very good friend, the ranking minority member, to the other members of the committee and to the staff for the really marvelous work they all did in producing the profoundly significant piece of legislation which is now before us.

There are so many important sections of H.R. 5, that time precludes me from mentioning them all. The bill strengthens such vital programs as chapter 2, Adult Education, Immigrant Education, Math and Science Education, Magnet Schools, and others. H.R. 5 also includes a new Gifted and Talented program championed by my friend and colleague from New York, MARIO BLAGGI. The largest provision in H.R. 5 is the reauthorization of chapter 1—compensatory education for disadvantaged school children. This program, born during the Great Society initiatives of 1965, provides economically and educationally disadvantaged children with the remedial help they so desperately need to keep pace with their peers.

The strength of the chapter 1 bill is reflected in its bipartisan support. The primary authors of the legislation, Chairman HAWKINS and Congressman GOODLING are to be commended for their tremendous efforts. The bill strengthens the chapter 1 program with the inclusion of several new provisions. The even start and dropout prevention initiatives will expand remedial education to eligible children in younger and older age groups. The concentration grant provision will target resources to the poorest—and the neediest—school districts. And the new section dealing with private schools represents a significant step forward in helping school districts cope with the crippling blow dealt to private school children by the misguided Supreme Court decision in *Aguliar* against *Felton*.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to what I consider to be the most crucial aspect of the debate over chapter 1—the issue of funding. In chapter 1, we

are clearly dealing with one of the most popular and successful of all Government programs. During our hearings, the committee received hundreds of hours of testimony, from rural and urban school districts, from teachers, parents and administrators, from corporate leaders and children's defense organizations, from public as well as private schools. Each witness lauded the fruits of chapter 1 while at the same time decrying the fact that the program is sorely underfunded.

The question that must be addressed, Mr. Chairman, such a popular and clearly effective program is serving only 50 percent of the eligible students? So as we reauthorize chapter 1, we must make every possible effort to ensure that as much money as possible is made available for chapter 1—and the sooner the better.

I therefore want to point out to our colleagues, and to anyone in the country who may be listening, that one of the virtues of the bill is that it does provide full funding through fiscal year 1993 for the chapter 1 program by increasing the level of authorized funds for chapter 1 by \$500 million a year beginning in the 1989 fiscal year. So by the time this reauthorization expires, if the Appropriations Committee and the Congress see fit to actually appropriate the full amount we are authorizing, there should be enough money available to provide every educationally and economically deprived youngster in this Nation with the remedial educational services which they require.

Mr. Chairman, an investment in chapter 1 is an investment in our children's future, and the future of our Nation. The high numbers of needy children unserved by chapter 1 jeopardize our country's ability to develop educated, literate and self-sufficient youths and adults. This negligence threatens our ability to maintain a healthy national economy and a productive work force and weakens our standing as the preeminent leader in economic leadership.

There are those who argue that adding \$500 million a year to this program will "bust the budget." Please bear in mind that a half a billion dollars is a drop in the bucket of the overall budget—amounting to 5 hundredths of 1 percent of the trillion dollars we spend each year. It would represent less than a 1 percent increase in new Federal spending. We will have to look long and hard to find other Federal programs with such a minimal impact on our budget but which bring such dramatic benefits to our Nation.

The consequences of underfunding chapter 1 are frightening. I would like my colleagues to consider what happens to children who turn 18 with the weakest math and reading scores relative to their peers. They are 8 times more likely to bear children out of wedlock. They are 7 times more likely to drop out before graduation. They

are 4 times more likely to be out of work and school. And they are 4 times more likely to be forced to turn to welfare. Chapter 1 has a proven track record in reducing the danger of these unconscionable scenarios. Full funding of the program is, therefore, an obligation we owe to our children, and to our Nation's future.

Earlier today we passed the Defense Authorization Act. But the security of our country lies not only in the strength of our military, but in the education of our children. I urge my colleagues to support full funding of chapter 1. I also urge all the Members of the House to cast their vote today for final passage of H.R. 5, one of the finest pieces of legislation to be deliberated by this body for a long time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

(Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for H.R. 5, and my appreciation to Chairman HAWKINS and to the ranking Republicans on the subcommittee and full committee, Mr. GOODLING and Mr. JEFFORDS, for their efforts in getting to this point with this legislation. The degree of bipartisan support for H.R. 5, and the acclaim for the improvements in the bill from the education community, are testimony, I think, to their efforts in leading the committee through this reauthorization process.

I particularly want to commend the chairman for what is a fiscally responsible elementary and secondary education bill. We are well aware of the fact that by most estimates we are only serving about one-half of the children deemed eligible for services under chapter 1, and the bill makes it a goal to increase this share each year until full funding is reached. At the same time, we all know very well the budget constraints we face, and are likely to continue to face for some time. Our challenge in the 1980's is to make those programs begun in the sixties and seventies to expand opportunities more accountable, more carefully targeted, and yet flexible enough to address new and emerging areas of concern. I am pleased that H.R. 5 attempts to do just that.

Last year, Mr. PETRI and I, along with a number of other members of the House Wednesday Group, introduced legislation to substantially revise the chapter 1 program. We made very clear at that time that our intent was to identify areas of concern with the chapter 1 program, and to provoke discussion, and hopefully legislative change, toward addressing these concerns.

Although not all of the issues we raised have been addressed in H.R. 5, many of them have been. Two of our chief concerns were the issues of targetting of services, and accountability on the part of those who receive Fed-

eral funds to provide compensatory education services. I want to briefly note the legislative changes in H.R. 5 which address these concerns.

First, on the issue of targetting of services, the bill makes changes, as others have noted, in the concentration grant formula and in the way in which funds may be spent amongst schools within a district, so as to target those areas which have the greatest concentration and intensity of poverty. The bill emphasizes a second important aspect of targetting—that is, which students within a school which has a chapter 1 program should be served. Under the bill, each such school must rank its students, using educationally related objective criteria, and serve those most in need of services, unless one of the exceptions to this requirement applies. Thus chapter 1 cannot be used, for example, as a way to get troublesome students out of the regular classroom for part of the day. Only those students most in need of services may receive the services.

The second issue which our bill focused on, and which H.R. 5 makes important improvements in is the whole area of accountability. The chapter 1 program, as the studies show, has had a measure of success in raising the reading and math skills of these students who participate. The concern is for those school-specific programs which for whatever reason do not work, and for those students who, for whatever reason, do not show improvement as a result of receiving chapter 1 services. The bill requires that first the LEA, and then, if that is not successful, the SEA, provide help and assistance to individual schools in improving their programs, where those programs have not succeeded in improving the skills of the students being served by chapter 1. There is a range of program improvement initiatives which should be considered in doing so, taking into account the particular circumstances of the school—in some cases it might only require some training and technical assistance, in other cases it might require the reassignment of personnel—and the LEA and the SEA should look at all of these possibilities. In addition to accountability at the school level, we are concerned about individual students who remain in the program for several years without significant improvement. In those cases, the school should consider whether the chapter 1 program is the appropriate placement for the child, or whether another compensatory program might be necessary.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and his staff for the time and energy they

have expended in assembling and advancing this omnibus education bill. Thanks to the chairman's direction, the committee carried out a comprehensive and thorough review or more than a dozen basic Federal education programs covered in this legislation.

H.R. 5 will lay the foundation and enhance our capacity to solve the critical problems which confront us—our lack of economic competitiveness; domestic unemployment and dependence on government assistance; the threats to public health posed by drug use and teenage pregnancy, to name a few—all depend on education and effective schooling.

H.R. 5 reaffirms the fact that furthering our educational opportunities is in the national interest, the Federal Government shares responsibility with the States and local communities in providing our young people with effective schooling. In so doing, the bill repudiates the administration's ideological arguments against Federal support for education.

I am particularly pleased with the strides that have been made in Indian education. The committee has adopted language that will clearly prohibit any attempt by the BIA to unilaterally force Indian schools to contract. Consultation provisions were included to ensure greater participation by the tribes—this is a long-awaited improvement. In response to Assistant Secretary Swimmer's proposal to require Bureau schools to contract, I authored an amendment that would provide for five model schools that would offer the stability of a Bureau school and the economic independence of a contract school. My legislation says, "yes we do have problems in Indian education, but let's not run away from these problems, Let's meet them head on."

I am pleased to have worked with Congressman KILDEE on the Indian Self Determination Grants Act of 1987. This legislation was developed after long and hard deliberations within the Indian community. It builds upon the Indian Self Determination Act of 1975, and provides for specific timelines and guidelines for each set of schools. This act will provide for increased self-determination and a better quality of education in our Indian schools.

For many illiterate adults, adult education is their only hope for adapting to recent changes in our economy which have largely wiped out their traditional livelihoods. These adults do not have the basic reading and writing skills needed for most jobs, nor are they likely to be accepted or to benefit from job and vocational training without further education.

Yet most adult education programs tend to serve mostly those adults who already read and write at the sixth-grade level or above. We clearly see the need to focus more attention on the most needy. For this reason, Congressman COOPER and I successfully

□ 1740

passed an amendment to redirect adult education funds to those reading at the fifth-grade level or below. This is an important step toward reaching the most illiterate in our society and I look forward to more efforts in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, honesty compels me to share my disappointment over the compromise amendment adopted by the committee regarding bilingual education provisions. The amendment calls for expanding future funding of monolingual, English-only instructional programs under the Bilingual Education Act.

The amendment flies in the face of the testimony presented to the committee in three separate hearings. It runs counter to the facts available to the committee.

This spring the General Accounting Office released a report on the research evidence concerning bilingual education. The GAO report confirmed that dual language instruction—teaching in English and the student's native language—is more effective than English-only instruction in helping children learn English and academic subjects. GAO's central finding is repeated in other national studies and reports. The studies show that limited-English-proficient students learn faster, learn more, and stay in school longer when schools utilize and build upon their native language skills.

This is the reason why bilingual education is supported by language-minority parents and a growing number of professional education associations, including the American Society for Curriculum Development, the National Education Association, the Joint National Committee on Languages, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Association of School Administrators.

During the debate on the committee amendment, my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. FORN, noted that the amendment has nothing to do with education; nothing to do with teaching or learning; it is a political compromise, pure and simple. The gentleman's observations are accurate.

Since September 1985, the Secretary of Education has waged war on the Bilingual Education Act. First, he branded the entire program a "failure" declaring that:

After 17 years of Federal involvement, and after \$1.7 billion of Federal funding . . . we have no evidence that the children who we sought to help . . . have benefited.

Next, the Secretary argued that there was no research evidence to support native language instruction for LEP students while they are learning English.

Appropriations for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act title VII have been slashed by nearly 250 percent since 1980—through inflation and budget reductions. As a result, the Bilingual Education Act today serves over 100,000 fewer students than it did 6 years ago. Meanwhile, the limited-

English-proficient students population continues to grow 2½ times as fast as the overall student population.

Despite my deep concerns over the bilingual compromise amendment, I strongly support H.R. 5. The bill's other amendments to the Bilingual Education Act, originally set out in H.R. 1755 which I coauthored with Chairman HAWKINS and my colleagues Mr. KILDEE and Mr. MARTINEZ, make many important changes in this vital and successful program.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to another new, bright light on our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for the work they have done on this program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act. This legislation reaffirms the Federal role in elementary and secondary education through such programs as chapter 1 compensatory education, chapter 2 block grants, math and science education, bilingual education, and several other programs.

Chapter 1 and chapter 2 represent the heart of the School Improvement Act. I strongly support reauthorization of chapter 1 which has been a very effective program in raising basic reading and mathematics skills for disadvantaged children. H.R. 5 also strengthens the chapter 1 program in a number of ways, but most importantly by enhancing the role of parental involvement in the education of their children. Studies have shown that when parents are involved in their child's education that the child does better in school. This is particularly important in the education of disadvantaged children. Chapter 1 encourages training parents to work with their children at home, consultation between teachers and parents and establishing parent advisory councils.

The chapter 2 block grants are essentially preserved in their current form and the changes that were made will enhance the effectiveness of the program. Chapter 2 will continue the current formula allocation which allows State and local authorities the ability to administer this important program in a way that meets the educational challenges of tomorrow. I also am pleased that chapter 2 maintains flexibility for effective school projects, instructional and educational materials, personnel enhancement and gifted and talented education projects.

The reauthorization of elementary and secondary education programs represents important contributions to our Nation's children and I encourage all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider this bill, nothing less than the future is at stake. The School Improvement Act helps build a better future. I would like to congratulate Mr. HAWKINS, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who has provided outstanding leadership in developing this important legislation. I also congratulate the minority for its role in developing and supporting this landmark legislation. The School Improvement Act builds on what works in the current programs, targets money where it will do the most good, and supports research and other actions to help create the foundations of the future.

However, I am especially concerned about bilingual education. It is one of the most vital issues that will be considered in this Congress. It will help determine whether this country will continue to build the American community by opening the doors to opportunity for all its citizens, or will isolate its minority language citizens into linguistic haves and have nots. Bilingual education can help keep kids in school and build the academic excellence they need to take advantage of the opportunities in our country.

Politeness is the art of choosing among your thoughts. There are many laudable things about the agreement reached on bilingual education. The compromise that Members reached may be politically expedient. However, I am seriously concerned that we are sending exactly the wrong messages in requiring that the overwhelming majority of new money, after holding harmless current activities, go only to SAIP while this disproportion in funding may have a certain short-term political logic, it is pouring money into immersion programs which show the least evidence of working when there is not enough money for the programs that have proven they work well. But it is the best we could do now, and we can only hope that the Members will learn more about the programs and come to realize the full importance of native language education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the ranking member, and the chairman of the committee for a very fine job in putting together a bill which I strongly support.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that we will be considering some very

important educational programs through H.R. 5, and I would like to make special mention of the impact aid program.

As many Members may know, impact aid is reimbursement by the Federal Government to local school districts. Such reimbursement is necessary when a school district loses part or all of its tax base due to a Federal presence such as a military base, Indian land, or Federal public housing.

Impact aid is payment in lieu of taxes. It is the Federal Government paying for the education of federally connected children. It is payment for services rendered.

However, impact aid funding is never what it should be. Today, we speak of percentages of entitlements and distribution of insufficient funds.

Mr. Chairman, this is just not fair. Those of us who support impact aid do not want to take away from educational programs, such as programs for the gifted or handicapped. These are very important programs. We just want the Congress to recognize the difference between impact aid and special programs. While other educational programs are over and above a school's basic operating budget, impact aid is part of a school's basic operating budget.

Since impact aid, unlike other programs, is indeed payment for services rendered, it should be an entitlement program. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2371, to make impact aid an entitlement. I will not pursue this goal during the consideration of H.R. 5, but I do believe it is a matter which should be given consideration.

I am very concerned that to get even 50 percent of full funding is an annual battle. I am also concerned that school districts do not even know how much impact aid they will be receiving until they are in the middle of their budget year.

I have some very clear ideas about where this program should be. I want an impact aid program that is fully funded. I want a program in which funding is automatic and we do not have to engage in yearly battles. I want a program that does not place an undue tax burden on permanent residents. And most important, I want an impact aid program which allows school districts to plan with confidence.

I therefore urge reauthorization of impact aid today, and I invite my colleagues to cosponsor my bill H.R. 2371.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman HAWKINS for his stewardship of this bill. As a new member of the Education and Labor Commit-

tee, I have been privileged to work with the chairman and my respect for him has only increased. His unfailing efforts to bring to the House floor such a comprehensive measure that is strongly supported by both sides of the aisle is a tribute to his leadership. Additionally, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the contributions of Congressmen JEFFORDS and GOODLING, the ranking minority members on the committee. Their efforts to place education above partisan politics is admirable.

This bill reauthorizes 14 programs that address the educationally needy and disadvantaged. Throughout our history, education has played a central role in allowing each successive generation to achieve beyond their predecessor. During the extensive hearings and subsequent markup of H.R. 5, I was constantly reminded of the critical role education has played in improving the lives of Americans and bringing about continued progress for the Nation.

Included in this measure is an amendment that I authored whose purpose is to strengthen the Center for Education Statistics. Education is the second largest industry in the Nation. It is overwhelmingly supported by public tax dollars, thus making it crucial that adequate data be available to determine its efficiency and progress in providing educational services to the American people.

The general design and duties of the Center for Education Statistics are to acquire and diffuse useful statistical information on subjects connected with education. Data and information provided by the Center is used by Congress to help formulate policy and monitor progress in education. The National Academy of Sciences, funded by the Department of Education, recently issued a report in September 1986, that concluded that unless there were wide-ranging actions to change both the image and reality of the Center, we are unanimous in our conviction that serious consideration be given to the more drastic alternatives of abolishing the Center and finding other means to obtain and disseminate education data.

For example, the committee and Congress are deeply concerned about the impact school dropouts have on the country. However, in spite of some efforts of the Center, there is no way of determining exactly what constitutes a dropout nor how many dropouts there are. The amendment puts into law many of the National Academy of Sciences' major recommendations, as well as those of the administration, leaders in the education and statistic fields and various congressional committees. Among other things, the amendment:

Established the first national education indicator to be presented to Congress on an annual basis examining dropout and retention rates of students. This is similar to other national

indicators that document unemployment, productivity, poverty, and family income.

Sets up a system to accept data from all the States that is comparable, using common definitions and parameters. A small State training program is provided to train the States to collect and provide quality and uniform data. This is identical to several of the President's proposals contained in his competitiveness initiatives.

Models the improvements to the Center on the other major established statistical agencies, such as Bureau of Labor Statistics, Census and the National Center for Health Statistics.

Provides for partial reimbursement for the States for establishing comparable statistical standards using funding models from other such centers.

Provides privacy protections to those who provide information. Presently, there are no such measures. If financial information provided to a college for financial aid information is used by the Center in a study, there are no guarantees that this information will remain private.

Makes the Director of the Center a Presidential appointee, like their counterpart at the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Additionally, like the BLS Commissioner, the 4-year term does not run concurrently with the President's, thus insuring independence from political pressure.

Authorizes appropriations for the Center of approximately \$26 million for fiscal year 1988, \$5 million more than the President's present request for the Center.

In conclusion, I believe that this bill is perhaps the most far-reaching education measure that the 100th Congress will consider. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. By doing so, we reaffirm our commitment that education is, and must remain, a national priority.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just point out three additional things that I failed to point out, one of which is the most important which will come at the end.

First of all, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and I worked for years to try to do something about the auditing problem that we were having in many school districts.

In this bill we, as a matter of fact, now give school districts and States an opportunity to defend themselves before they really were out there with no defense whatsoever. We had some bright staffers that figured out a way how we could do this, and so that is part of the bill that is very important.

Second, I think it is important to point out particularly to my side of the aisle that we are talking about \$779 million in new authorization; but it is important to point out to the Members that we really in this budget,

as well as the Senate budget, the House budget and the Senate budget allowed \$2.2 billion, so we are only asking for \$779 million of that.

□ 1750

That gives the Committee on Appropriations a lot of room to take care of the additional authorization.

Lastly, let me say that we do not say enough about the effort of the staff. What we do, as Members, we throw the staff to the wolves. The wolves are all the lobbyists out there, and we say—including some of our colleagues, as a matter of fact—and we say you go and you soothe their feelings and you go straighten them out and you go work something out with them, and then we come to the floor and take credit for what has happened. I cannot say enough about the effort of the staff on both sides because they have provided tremendous leadership.

We have a good bill. We are well under the budget with the bill and it would be my hope that we can get a unanimous vote tomorrow and then we will show some of these other committees how you are supposed to do things in committee, and not write bills on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] has 3 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has yielded back his time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, it is a great source of satisfaction for me to rise in strong support of this bill. I cut my eyeteeth in Congress in 1965 as a first-term member of the Committee on Education and Labor in helping to write the Education Act and helping write title I and title III. I was very proud to have played even a minor role in this great piece of legislation which we are enhancing and enlarging on today.

I want to express my admiration to the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], for the outstanding leadership he has provided this committee and, as well, my admiration for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for having brought this bill to the floor with virtually total bipartisan support.

He is absolutely right, the minority ranking member, when he says this is the way we ought to legislate. This is a splendid outstanding piece of legislation and I congratulate all, on both sides of the aisle, that had anything to do with it.

All of this bill is constructive and needed and necessary. I would simply

like to highlight one aspect of the bill that I am particularly concerned with; namely, the question of adult illiteracy, which is a plague on our society, an albatross around our necks, the most important social problem facing America. How can we have a whole, how can we have a healthy, how can we have a sound economy or a healthy society when we are faced with this pitiful subclass of Americans who cannot read, write and count?

Of the people in our prisons today, 50 percent are functionally illiterate; 75 percent of the unemployed are functionally illiterate; and 85 percent of the youth in our juvenile court system are functionally illiterate.

We talk about productivity, and I echo the words you have just heard. How can we be a productive Nation and compete with the nations of Western Europe, with Japan, with Korea, with Singapore, with Hong Kong, with Taiwan when these nations are 95 percent-plus literate; most of them 99 percent-plus literate? It is a shame and a blight on America that one-third of our adult workforce, by many estimates, are functionally illiterate.

The committee report says 20 to 70 percent. With \$200 million diverted to adult literacy, that means we are spending between \$3 and \$10 for adult illiterate in this country.

It is obvious that we are only barely beginning to meet the challenge, but this bill is a great step forward. It includes some kind of programming for the 5 million people now of our 25 to 75 million functionally illiterate.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, as a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I rise today to give my full and enthusiastic support to H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act. Without question, this is the most important and sweeping elementary and secondary education legislation to be considered by the House in more than a decade.

This omnibus bill extends through 1993, many of our most critical education programs, especially those directed at the most needy of our people. These programs include chapter 1—the largest Federal aid program to elementary and secondary schools—chapter 2, adult education, bilingual education, and impact aid. This measure also creates a new program for the gifted and talented, a provision of which I am proud to have authored; focuses additional resources and services on drop-out prevention efforts and basic skills improvements; and establishes a new preschool and literacy program.

But most importantly, H.R. 5 ensures that the Federal Government meets the challenge and fulfills its role in the education of our citizens. It represents the Federal response to the clamor for education reform—a response demanded by the people of this country as they recognize the crucial role education plays with respect to the strength, vitality, and well-being of our Nation.

Nowhere is the need for education reform more accurately reflected than in the theme of "competitiveness", now espoused by the administration, Congress, business, and the public at large. We are grappling with ways to compete more effectively in the international

marketplace, and strengthen our scientific and technological edge. We are struggling to reduce the budget and the trade deficits, while we are working to expand the economy. We, as a Nation, can no longer afford to ignore our most precious national resource—the minds and potential of our people, especially our children, who hold the promise and the key to this country's future.

This potential is perhaps greatest in our gifted and talented students—students who can transform and invigorate our culture and economy and provide our society with the contributions we so desperately need. But unless we recognize and develop the abilities of these students during their elementary and secondary years, much of their special potential for contributing to the national interest will be lost. The new Gifted and Talented Program within H.R. 5 is critical if we are to maximize the capabilities of our brightest and most promising students and ensure they receive adequate, appropriate, and more specific educational services.

Since the start of this decade, with the demise of the National Program for Gifted and Talented Education, and the abolishment of its office within the Department of Education, gifted and talented programming in this Nation has suffered from acute educational neglect. Of all evidence pointing to deterioration in this area, none is more alarming than the decline in the achievements of these students. One out of every five of our Nation's gifted and talented students is a high school dropout. Of those that do graduate, 40 percent will not go on to college if they have not received specialized instruction in school. Approximately half of gifted and talented students work at least four grades below this potential.

These statistics are consistent with "A Nation At Risk," a report issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education. The report noted, "over half of the gifted students do not match their tested ability with comparable achievement in school" and that "both the number and proportion of students demonstrating superior achievement in the scholastic aptitude test have also dramatically declined." One clear recommendation emerged: "The Federal Government, in cooperation with States and localities should help meet the needs of key groups of students such as the gifted and talented."

Is the Federal Government now meeting that challenge? Are we really trying to tap this vast unexplored resource? Consider that at this time, we are spending less than \$5 per child in Federal funds to support the brightest and most promising of our Nation's students. Clearly, if there is to be a reasonable response to promote quality and excellence in the classroom, then we must adopt this provision within H.R. 5. It is a modest effort designed to support State and local programs that address the unique and pressing needs of gifted and talented students.

Funds will also be used for teacher training activities, and to establish a national center for the education of the gifted. Both of these components are vital if we are to succeed in redeveloping a gifted and talented program at the national level. This provision is identical to my bill, H.R. 543, which enjoys the strong, bipartisan support of 102 Members. It is similar to the bill I introduced last year, which re-

ceived unanimous House approval. It is a program that is long overdue.

Yet at the cornerstone of this reauthorization is the Chapter 1 Program—the bedrock of Federal efforts to meet the special educational needs of low-income and disadvantaged children.

The Chapter 1 Program is a shining example of what can, and what must be done to improve the educational opportunities of our Nation's needy children. It is a proven and successful program that exemplifies the best in education efforts at the Federal level. This reauthorization will allow the Chapter 1 Program to retain its existing structure, while permitting expansion and refinement of this very effective program.

For example, the concentration grant provision in chapter 1 will focus additional resources and services on those areas most in need. This provision is a result of a carefully constructed compromise by our committee, designed to ensure that large States, small States, urban, suburban, and the rural areas of this country all benefit from these new and extra resources.

The schoolwide projects provisions will permit schools with a substantial population of needy students—75 percent—the flexibility and the opportunity needed to upgrade the entire school's educational program, thus benefiting more students. This year, the committee deleted the State and local matching requirement, which prevented almost all of the eligible schools from participating in this unique project, but retained the relatively large percentage—75—needed to qualify under this provision. I am pleased that the committee approved a number of my amendments regarding schoolwide projects, amendments I firmly believe will strengthen and enhance this provision.

This reauthorization also marked the very first time the committee has had an opportunity to address the Aguilar versus Felton Supreme Court decision—a decision that left services to our needy nonpublic schoolchildren virtually paralyzed. I believe the committee has made an important effort in addressing this issue, and I am proud to note a number of amendments I authored designed to ensure that our nonpublic school students are also granted much-needed chapter 1 supplemental educational services.

And finally, I wish to recognize the new Dropout Prevention and Reentry Program—a critical step in efforts to address one of the most serious and pressing education crisis in my own district in New York City, and across the entire Nation. The dropout problem is a tragedy reaching epidemic proportions. The new program contained within H.R. 5 is a first and firm step forward toward addressing this crisis. I commend my good friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] for the leadership he has provided to both the committee and the Congress in this area.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize the fine efforts of our chairman, GUS HAWKINS, and the ranking minority member, BILL GOODLING for the exceptional work they performed in crafting this important legislation. Their contributions to this process have been outstanding, and their leadership of the highest caliber. It was a pleasure to work with these fine gentlemen, and all of the members of the Education and Labor Committee, in the development of H.R. 5. This bill is a commitment on the

part of my fellow committee members, and must be a commitment on the part of the entire Congress, that each and every American be granted a sound, a solid, and an enduring education.

Passage of this legislation provides us the tools—but we must be given the resources to ensure the tools complete the work. As President Reagan noted in his State of the Union address, "Excellence Is What Makes Freedom Ring!"

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity today to improve the tomorrow for thousands of disadvantaged children. American education is at a crossroads and we can no longer afford to be a "Nation at Risk," providing unequal educational experiences for our children.

H.R. 5 is vital for this country and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. While corporations desperately seek a qualified labor pool and we grapple with the problem of a trade deficits, vast numbers of our youth waste away their days on street corners, barely literate and incapable of finding a decent job.

Consider the following: 14 million children live below the poverty level. Fifty percent of all black children and 40 percent of all Hispanic children are poor. Eighty percent of all children eligible for Headstart programs receive no service. Twenty percent of all newborns—many born to teenage mothers—are premature and at risk of becoming educationally delayed. Consider also that programs serving children and families have already lost \$10 billion a year since 1980.

All the news in education is not bleak, however, thanks to programs like Chapter I and II. More than 60 percent of Maryland's disadvantaged students are gaining a year scholastically for each year in school. Over 82,500 volunteers helped out in schools with 4 million hours of service in 1985. That's a lot of commitment—and a lot of love. Maryland's schools regularly provide special programs to 51,000 gifted youth. That represents almost 8 percent of our school population.

During the 1987–88 school year, 116 public schools and approximately 21 nonpublic schools will be eligible for Chapter I services in Baltimore City. After school tutorial programs, high intensity reading and math labs, elementary guidance counselors and parental involvement programs are all possible because of Federal funding. Chapter II funds provide teacher assistance, dropout retrieval programs and curriculum development. These programs can make a tremendous impact on a child's life, especially if his opportunities for enrichment at home are negligible.

We cannot afford to renege on our commitment to educational opportunity during the coming era in which youth will be in short supply. We cannot afford to have a different standard of education for the privileged and another standard for the poor. Targeting our resources makes sense, both educationally and morally and I urge the support of this House for this important legislation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987.

We call my State of Arkansas, the Land of Opportunity. Arkansians have strong values. Arkansians want to work to support themselves. In fact, yesterday I received in my office a petition containing more than 60

pages of signatures of people from Phillips and Lee Counties who want training and job opportunities. Arkansians need the education opportunities this bill will help support.

A major effort to improve the education opportunities available to our people is underway in Arkansas. My State is not looking for a handout from the Federal Government. It does need a helping hand. It does need the Federal Government to recognize and respond to the education needs of Arkansas and the Nation. The Nation has a deep, vested interest in the quality of education Arkansians and all Americans get.

This is the most far-reaching education bill of the decade. It comes before us at a time of when there is almost unprecedented concern and interest, at the State and local level, in quality education. Under this bill, the Federal Government would strengthen its commitment to be supportive of State and local efforts toward excellence in education.

In its "Action for Excellence" report, the Education Commission for the States' Task Force on Education for Economic Growth said:

This is no time for the Federal Government to shirk these responsibilities, or to shrink suddenly from the issue of education as a national priority. The Federal Government's role, to be sure, is a supporting role. But that role is essential.

The brain power of the people of Arkansas and the Nation is our most valuable natural resource. It is vital that we put it to work for our economic, political and military security by liberating this brainpower through education.

The 1980 census found that only 55.5 percent of the Arkansas 25-year-old or older were high school graduates. In First District, which I represent, the percentage was 45.7. The bill before us would not only help State and local educational institutions remove obstacles to learning, it would support efforts to encourage school age youngsters to stay the course through graduation.

Like many other States, Arkansas is experiencing a rising concern over the numbers of young people and adults who can neither read nor write well enough to fill out a job application, if they can read and write at all. This bill would support programs to improve literacy among Arkansians and Americans.

Teachers are among the most dedicated, self-sacrificing, most poorly rewarded, and most important professionals in our Nation. This bill backs programs which would help better equip and support our teachers in accomplishing their goal of educating our people.

These are but a few of the important programs which would be authorized under this bill. It is a good bill. It is a bill this Nation needs. I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, as a co-sponsor of H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act, I rise in support of this most important legislation.

H.R. 5 seeks to reauthorize the very crucial programs of our Federal Government in elementary and secondary education. Programs to be reauthorized under the School Improvement Act are chapter 1 compensatory education, bilingual education, education block grants, and Impact Aid. Other provisions of H.R. 5 would authorize mathematics and sci-

ence education, magnet schools in school districts undergoing desegregation, and very importantly drug education.

Mr. Chairman, much is being said these days about the imperative that our Nation maintain a competitive place in the changing international economy. H.R. 5 and the programs it would reauthorize will do much to improve our educational system and thereby advance our Nation's future ability to compete.

H.R. 5 is also a prodemocracy bill seeking to open up opportunity to participate in civil life through education for all of our children.

The School Improvement Act would provide assistance for school districts with high concentrations of low-income families and would authorize new preschool and high school programs to encourage the expansion of compensatory education services beyond the elementary school level.

One feature of H.R. 5 that will prove most valuable is the Even Start Program which will combine basic adult literacy education for parents with preschool education for their children. An additional provision would authorize funds to prevent students in high school from dropping out.

This legislation represents government at its best, enhancing the national interest and opening up the doors of opportunity for all the people of the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, at this time when we are debating the reauthorization of 14 education programs, I think it is highly appropriate that we consider the content and quality of the education we provide for our children.

Mr. Chairman, in our value-free society, we often fear being identified with specific values. I'd like to draw your attention to a new movement, termed "cultural conservatism," that is based on one central theme: That Judeo-Christian values are necessary for the survival of Western society. Cultural conservatism does not require a belief in God nor in religious absolutes. Rather, a cultural conservative as defined by a prominent conservative and a prominent liberal, is someone who believes that "There is a necessary, unbreakable, and causal relationship between traditional Western, Judeo-Christian values, definitions of right and wrong, ways of thinking and ways of living . . . and the secular success of Western societies. If the former are abandoned, the latter will be lost."

In a November 1986 American Spectator article, Mr. Chester Finn, counselor to Department of Education Secretary William Bennett, applies the themes of cultural conservatism to the field of education. I believe these tenets of "educational cultural conservatism" would go a long way in improving our education system, and in establishing sound values in our children. Finn's 10 tenets follow:

First, the public and private school curricula should be revised to include, alongside the three R's, a new discipline called cultural literacy.

Second, educators should stop denigrating "beliefs," especially religious beliefs, as having no place in public discussion.

Third, parents, teachers, and professors should make moral development and character formation explicit goals, and they should serve as role models of moral behavior. Government policy should support good behavior.

Fourth, schools should stop teaching that different cultures are morally equal. They

should start teaching that democracy is superior to communism and that every citizen's participation in democracy is vital to its survival.

Fifth, schools should extol limited government as a fundamental value of a democratic state, but at the same time, teach that within limits government and all major institutions should foster the fundamental values of Western culture.

Sixth, The United States should promote pluralism over monopoly in education and decentralization over centralization in all areas outside of a core curriculum. Individual schools should be granted more institutional sovereignty.

Seventh, parents should be allowed to select their children's schools and be held accountable for their choices.

Eighth, elementary and secondary schools should teach American history, and colleges and universities should extend and deepen the institution.

Ninth, all schools should provide children with "a solid core of essential skills and knowledges." Differences between the schools should lie outside of that core.

Tenth, discipline standards should be firmly and fairly enforced. Continual efforts should be made "to replace external sanctions with internal controls," largely through the exemplary moral conduct of the student's teachers and professors.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to draw your attention to an article found in the Washington Post this morning. The article follows:

**TEACHING OF DEMOCRATIC VALUES URGED—
COALITION CALLS FOR END TO NATIONAL
SELF-CRITICISM IN SCHOOLS**

(By Barbara Vobejda)

A broad mix of leaders from government and the private sector, ranging from People for the American Way to the National Association of Evangelicals, joined yesterday in calling for restructured school curriculum that would extol democracy as "the worthiest form of government ever conceived."

The statement, which calls for an end to the self-criticism of the Vietnam and Watergate eras in school curriculum, bears 150 names, including Secretary of Education William J. Bennett, Walter F. Mondale, Jimmy Carter, Gerald R. Ford and leaders of both major teachers' unions, as well as the organization of evangelicals and People for the American Way, an organization founded to counter the religious right.

In a document titled, "Education for Democracy," the group said "we fear that many young Americans are growing up without the education needed to develop a solid commitment to those 'notions and sentiments' essential to a democratic form of government."

It urged that history and humanities be taught in more depth, starting as early as the primary grades and called for more attention to world studies, with students required to study thoroughly at least one non-Western society. The curriculum, the group said, should be reordered around a core of history and geography, taught from the perspective of "understanding under what conditions people can enjoy rights and freedom."

"The idea is that history should be taught with objectivity, but not with neutrality," said Diane Ravitch, chairwoman of the Educational Excellence Network, which sponsored the project with the American Federation of Teachers and Freedom House, an or-

ganization that monitors political and civil liberties.

The statement, released at a news conference in Washington yesterday, was the most recent in a series of recommendations that the nation's schools move away from the "values-free" teaching said to be prevalent in the 1960s and '70s. At a conference sponsored last month by People for the American Way, it became clear that politically liberal groups had moved closer to their conservative counterparts in advocating that schools should teach civic virtue and take clear positions on right and wrong behavior.

Yesterday's statement echoed that theme. "Education for democracy . . . must extend to education in moral issues," the document said. "The basic ideas of liberty, equality and justice, of civil, political and economic rights are all assertions of right and wrong, or moral values. . . . It is absurd to argue that the state, or its schools, cannot be concerned with citizens' ability to tell right from wrong. . . ."

In criticizing the current curriculum, the document cited a teaching guide on human rights that gave equal significance to the "right" to take vacations, freedom of speech and the right to vote. It also cited surveys of high school seniors that showed confidence in democracy has declined since 1968 and that half the students couldn't identify Winston Churchill or Joseph Stalin.

AFT president Albert Shanker said that the project, which is funded by the Department of Education, the California Department of Public Instruction and several private foundations, will review social studies textbooks this year and train teachers across the country to evaluate curriculum materials to determine how well the materials cover the development of democracy.

The document, which is meant to serve as a curriculum guide, will be distributed to state and local school superintendents, legislatures, governors and more than 600,000 members of the union, Shanker said.

"There will be some controversy," he said, referring to expected criticism that the recommendations are ethnocentric or deny the worth of other cultures. "We believe that the values of freedom and democracy . . . are preferable to their alternatives. And we believe that the curriculum should reflect this."

Emphasizing the central role that history must play in teaching democratic values, Ravitch recommended that schools teach history in the early grades, infusing more "real content" through the tales of heroes who fought for democracy. History should not be "just memorizing a parade of facts," Ravitch said, but should be "organized around the struggle of people 'to enjoy democracy.'"

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation, H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987. As a strong advocate of public education and a believer in the importance of youth in our society and the future of this Nation, I am pleased to have this opportunity to support this comprehensive and crucial piece of legislation.

Education reform has been and will continue to be the issue of the 1980's. With this package, Mr. Chairman, the Congress is restating its firm commitment to excellence in education. Advancements in technology begin in the primary grade levels when firm foundations of phonics, arithmetic, and discipline are nurtured at home and in the classroom.

In this era of budget constraints and budget cuts, Mr. Chairman, it is mandatory that we as a nation and we in Congress set our national

priorities. Dedication to the education of our children is fundamental to progress in science, in international trade, in the creative arts, in space technology, in an informed electorate, and in a vital society.

Probably one of the most significant aspects of the School Improvement Act is the reauthorization of chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. As my colleagues know, chapter 1 is the largest Federal elementary and secondary program and provides compensatory education programs for educationally deprived children in low-income areas. Over the last 20 years, Mr. Chairman, chapter 1 with its reading, math, and nutrition services, and special assistance for children of migrant workers and handicapped children has made tremendous strides in meeting the needs of our Nation's children.

On the national level, one study after another has come to the conclusion that these services are effective and productive. The Department of Education's report shows an increase in the percentile ranks of chapter 1 students in reading and math for every grade except 12th grade. In the March 1987 testimony presented by five senior executives of major corporations to the congressional Education Subcommittees, these business leaders stressed that "Chapter 1, because of its widespread acceptance, both politically and educationally, must remain the central element of our compensatory education initiatives."

In my own State of New Jersey, Mr. Chairman, significant gains have been made in the testing scores of students in grades 2 through 8. In school year 1985-86, the reading scores rose in all but one grade and the math scores were outstanding and improved across-the-board.

The chapter 1 programs are enhanced by the commitment this bill makes to the total education of these children and their parents. Placing renewed emphasis on parental participation and involvement, activities and training programs for parents will be stressed as an integral aspect of the overall chapter 1 program. A new program called the Even Start Program will focus on high rate of illiteracy among adults. Mr. Chairman, not only will parents with limited skills be instructed in the basics of reading and math, they will have the opportunity to become partners in their own children's education.

In addition, the Federal commitment to the education of handicapped children under the chapter 1 program is again reiterated in this comprehensive bill. Mr. Chairman, never shall Congress weaken its support for the handicapped, and I am pleased that the funds are used to support the traditional programs such as preschool programs, education programs for multiple-handicapped, and for improvements in the development of individualized education programs. New and expanded opportunities will be fostered that allow handicapped children to participate with their non-handicapped peers in various educational settings and experiences.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to providing needed funds for educational programs for the underprivileged, H.R. 5 meets the challenge to excel beyond the level of our international peers in math and science education. By increasing authorization levels and boosting the amount of funds provided on the local level, this education bill recognizes our need to raise student achievement levels in math and

science programs. The funds are targeted for basic skills programs, teacher training initiatives, and the development of partnerships with public, private, and nonprofit agencies. With a comprehensive approach of beefing up the critical skills, Mr. Chairman, I believe this program will complement the new programs encompassed by the recently House-approved trade legislation which focus on foreign language proficiency and training in technological areas.

As cosponsor of the Jacob Javits Gifted and Talented Children and Youth Education Act, I am pleased that this measure has been incorporated into the final version of the measure before us. The children who have exceptional capabilities for intellectual, creative, and leadership skills hold one of the keys to America's scientific and technological advances, and our competitiveness in the international arena. The new gifted and talented provisions of H.R. 5 will significantly improve the education agenda for these children through promoting model programs, stimulating research and providing special training for educators.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation and display Congress' strong support for education in America and the future of our most precious commodity—our children.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. OLIN] having assumed the chair, Mr. VOLKMER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to improve elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS OF 1987

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1846) to make certain technical and conforming amendments in the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE: REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 1987".

(b) REFERENCE.—References in this Act to "the Act" are references to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

SEC. 2. INSTITUTIONAL AID.

(a) TECHNICAL PROVISIONS.—Title III of the Act is amended—

(1) in section 311(b)(1), by striking out "section 358(a)(1)" and inserting "section 360(a)(1)";

(2) in section 312(b)(1)—

(A) by inserting "which" before "is" each place it appears in subparagraphs (C) and (D);

(B) by inserting "which" before "has" in subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting "which" before "meets" in subparagraph (F);

(3) in section 312(b)(3), by striking out "subparagraphs (A) and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D)";

(4) in section 312(b)(5), by striking out "subparagraphs (A) and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D)";

(5) in section 312(c)(1), by inserting "in the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is being made" immediately after "Act";

(6) in section 312(c)(2)—

(A) by striking out "preceding fiscal year," and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which determination is being made,"; and

(B) by striking out "such fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "second preceding fiscal year";

(7) in section 323(a), by striking out "section 358(a)(2)" and inserting "section 360(a)(2)";

(8) in section 325(a)(1), by striking out "section 322" and inserting "section 323";

(9) in section 326(a)(2), by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "except that the Morehouse School of Medicine shall receive at least \$3,000,000";

(10) in section 326(c), by striking out "section 333" and inserting "section 332";

(11) in section 327(a), by striking out "Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "part";

(12) in section 332(f)(1), by inserting "(or section 355)" after "part A or B";

(13) in section 351(b)(6), by striking out "section 356" and inserting "section 357";

(14) in section 352(a)(2), by striking out "low- and middle-income" and inserting "low-income";

(15) in section 352(b), by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) The Secretary may waive the requirement set forth in section 312(b)(1)(E) in the case of an institution located on or near an Indian reservation or a substantial population of Indians, if the Secretary determines that the waiver will substantially increase higher education opportunities appropriate to the needs of American Indians.";

(16) in section 355(a) by inserting "or part B" immediately after "part A" each place it appears; and

(17) in section 355(b), by inserting "part A or" immediately before "part B" each place it appears.

(b) APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS.—Part A of title III of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS"

"SEC. 314. (a) REVIEW PANEL.—(1) All applications submitted under part A by institutions of higher education shall be read by a panel of readers composed of individuals

selected by the Secretary which shall include outside readers who are not employees of the Federal Government. The Secretary shall ensure that no individual assigned under this section to review any application has any conflict of interest with regard to that application which might impair the impartiality with which that individual conducts the review under this section.

"(2) The Secretary shall take care to include as readers representatives of historically and predominantly Black colleges, Hispanic institutions, Native American colleges and universities, and institutions with substantial numbers of students who are Hispanic, Native American, Asian American, and Native American Pacific Islander (including Native Hawaiians).

"(3) All readers selected by the Secretary shall receive thorough instruction from the Secretary regarding the evaluation process for applications submitted under part A, including—

"(A) explanations and examples of the types of activities referred to in section 311(b) that must receive special consideration for grants awarded under part A;

"(B) an enumeration of the factors to be used to determine the quality of applications submitted under part A; and

"(C) an enumeration of the factors to be used to determine whether a grant should be awarded for a project under part A, the amount of any such grant, and the duration of any such grant.

"(b) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—In awarding grants under part A, the Secretary shall take into consideration the recommendations of the panel established under subsection (a).

"(c) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than June 30 of each year, the Secretary shall notify each institution of higher education making an application under part A of—

"(1) the scores given the applicant by the panel pursuant to this section;

"(2) the recommendations of the panel with respect to such application; and

"(3) the reasons for the decision of the Secretary in awarding or refusing to award a grant under part A and any modifications, if any, in the recommendations of the panel made by the Secretary."

SEC. 3. PELL GRANTS.

"(a) CLARIFICATION OF REFERENCE.—Section 411(g)(2) of the Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (1)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(B)".

"(b) EXCLUSION OF FORCED SALE PROCEEDS.—(1) Section 411A of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) EXCLUSION OF FORCED SALE PROCEEDS.—In the computation of family contributions for the program under this subpart for any academic year, there shall be excluded from family income any proceeds of a sale of farm or business assets of that family if such sale results from a voluntary or involuntary foreclosure, forfeiture, or bankruptcy or an involuntary liquidation."

(2) Section 411B(g) of the Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "paragraphs (1) through (7)" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting "paragraphs (1) through (6)"; and

(B) by striking out paragraph (7).

(3) Section 411C(f) of the Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "paragraphs (1) through (7)" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting "paragraphs (1) through (6)"; and

(B) by striking out paragraph (7).

(4) Section 411D(f) of the Act is amended by striking out paragraph (5).

(c) TREATMENT OF EXCLUDABLE INCOME.—(1) Sections 411B(d)(1)(A), 411C(e)(1)(A), and 411D(c)(1)(A) are each amended by inserting before the semicolon ", less any excludable income (as defined in section 411F(9))".

(2) Section 411B(i)(1)(A) of the Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "other than amounts earned under part C of this title"; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon ", less any excludable income (as defined in section 411F(9))".

(d) EFFECTIVE FAMILY INCOME.—Section 411B(d)(1) of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by striking out "minus" at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting "and"; and

(3) by inserting after such subparagraph the following:

"(C) one-half of the student's total veterans educational benefits, excluding Veterans' Administration contributory benefits, expected to be received during the award period, minus".

(e) CONTRIBUTION FROM STUDENT'S AND SPOUSE'S ASSETS.—Section 411B(i) of the Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that in the case of a student who is a dislocated worker (certified in accordance with title III of the Job Training Partnership Act) or a displaced homemaker (as defined in section 480(e) of this Act), the net value of a principal place of residence shall be considered to be zero".

(f) ASSESSMENT OF DISCRETIONARY INCOME.—(1) Section 411B(f)(1) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) ASSESSMENT OF DISCRETIONARY INCOME.—(1) The discretionary income that is assessed under this subsection is equal to (A) the effective family income (as determined under subsection (d)), minus (B) the total offsets to such income (as determined under subsection (e)). If such discretionary income is a negative amount, the contribution from the parents' income is zero."

(2) Section 411C(e)(1) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) ASSESSMENT OF DISCRETIONARY INCOME.—(1) The discretionary income that is assessed under this subsection is equal to (A) the effective family income (as determined under subsection (c)), minus (B) the total offsets to such income (as determined under subsection (d)). If such discretionary income is a negative amount, the contribution from the student's (and spouse's) income is zero."

(3) Section 411D(e)(1) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) ASSESSMENT OF DISCRETIONARY INCOME.—(1) The discretionary income that is assessed under this subsection is equal to (A) the effective family income (as determined under subsection (c)), minus (B) the total offsets to such income (as determined under subsection (d)). If such discretionary income is a negative amount, the contribution from the student's (and spouse's) income is zero."

(4) Sections 411B(f)(2), 411B(j)(2), 411C(e)(2), and 411D(e)(2) of the Act are each amended by striking out "effective family income" each place it appears in the text thereof and inserting "discretionary income".

(5) The tables in sections 411B(f)(2) and 411C(e)(2) of the Act are each amended—

(A) by striking out "Effective family income" and inserting "Discretionary income"; and

(B) by striking out "effective family income" and inserting "discretionary income".

(g) TREATMENT OF DISLOCATED WORKERS AND DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS.—Sections 411B(g)(1), 411C(f)(1), and 411D(f)(3) of the

Act are each amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", except that in the case of a dislocated worker (certified in accordance with title III of the Job Training Partnership Act) or a displaced homemaker (as defined in section 480(e) of this Act), the net value of a principal place of residence shall be considered to be zero".

(h) CORRECTION OF REFERENCES.—(1) Section 411F(1)(B) is amended by striking out "paragraph (13)" and inserting "paragraph (15)".

(2) Section 411C(f)(5)(B) of the Act is amended by striking out "the calculation of effective family income required by subsection (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the assessment of discretionary income under subsection (e)".

(i) TUITION AND FEES.—Section 411F(5)(A) is amended by striking out "student's tuition and uniform compulsory fees" and inserting "tuition and uniform compulsory fees normally charged a full-time student".

(j) DEPENDENT OF A STUDENT.—Section 411F(6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) Except as otherwise provided, the term (A) 'dependent of the student' means the student's spouse, the student's dependent children, and other persons who live with and receive more than one-half of their support from the student and will continue to receive more than half of their support from the student during the award year; and (B) the term 'dependent of the parent' means the parents of the student, the student, any of the student's dependent children, dependent children of the student's parents, including those children who are deemed to be dependent students when applying for aid under this title, and other persons who live with and receive more than one-half of their support from the parents and will continue to receive more than half of their support from the parents during the award year."

(k) EXCLUDABLE INCOME.—Section 411F(9) of the Act is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking out "(B), (C), and (D)" and inserting "(B) through (E)";

(2) by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) For a Native American Student, the annual adjusted family income does not include any income and assets of \$2,000 or less per individual payment received by the student (and spouse) and student's parents under the Per Capita Act or the Distribution of Judgment Funds Act or any income received by the student (and spouse) and student's parents under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act or the Maine Indians Claims Settlement Act."

(3) in subparagraph (D), by inserting "(including any income earned from work under part C of this title)" after "financial assistance"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) Annual adjusted family income does not include any unemployment compensation received by a dislocated worker certified in accordance with title III of the Job Training Partnership Act."

(l) INDEPENDENT.—Section 411F(12) of the Act is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking out "graduate" and inserting "graduate"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(vi), by striking out "an annual total income" and by inserting in lieu thereof "annual total resources (including all sources of resources other than parents)".